

THE POSITIVE RELIGION.

*"I do not know which is better, whether to seek
God or to find Him." Jvanül Bagdadi.*

"If thou seek Him, He will be found of thee "
Chronicles. XXVIII. 9

By

J. C. GHOSE, M.A., B.L.,

*President of the Society of Theists, Member of the Bengal
Legislative Council for the University of Calcutta,
Honorary Fellow of the Calcutta University,
Author of the Principles of Hindu Law,
The Law of Impartible Property and The
Law of Endowments and Religious
Institutions. Editor of the
English works of Raja
Ram Mohun Roy
&c. &c.*

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY
H. L. BANERJI.
At the Calcutta Law Press, Bhowanipmr.

R.M.I.C LIBRARY	
Acc No	2896
Class	
Date	
St. Card	
Cl.	✓
Ch.	✓
Bk. Card	✓
Checked.	as

2, 896

CONTENTS.

	PAGES.
CHAPTER I.—Introduction	... 1
CHAPTER II.—Examination of different systems of religion	... 18
CHAPTER III.—Philosophy and religion	... 83
CHAPTER IV.—Science and religion	... 172
CHAPTER V.—The mystery of pain	... 291
CHAPTER VI.—The mystery of evil	... 320
CHAPTER VII.—The evolution of the good	... 347
CHAPTER VIII.—Definition of positive religion	... 410
CHAPTER IX.—God and self	... 443
CHAPTER X.—Prayer and worship	... 502
CHAPTER XI.—Mysticism	... 519
CHAPTER XII.—The positive rule of right conduct	... 550
CHAPTER XIII.—Woman and positive religion	... 594
CHAPTER XIV.—Religion and common life	... 606
CHAPTER XV.—The life eternal	... 626

ERRATA.

P. 22 l. 10 for ject read fect ; l. 14 for disappearance read disappearance. p. 27 l. 5 for beteen read between. p. 32 l. 29 for amcung read among p. 57 l. 13 for followers read follower. p. 83 l. 8 for partially read partiality. p. 84 l. 4 for reintegrates read reintegrate p. 84 l. 28 for opinione read opinions. p. 118 l. 15 omit that, l. 19 for other read our p. 119 l. 3 for times read time p. 123 l. 27 for says read say. p. 135 l. 5 after forms read or. p. 153 l. 24 for vegitable and vegetable p. 175 l. 13 for in read is. p. 190 l. 5 for compared read composed. p. 199 l. 16 for it read at p. 202 l. 7 for distrying read destroying. p. 205 l. 9 for Miller. read Muller. p. 232 l. 20 for ignrances read ignorance p. 256 l. 30 for empetus read impetus p. 262 l. 27 for McDongall read McDougall 290. l. 6 after those insert". p. 293 l. 4 read im for m, for ael read all; l. 11 omit the, for philosophy read philosophy, l. 17 for ascetism read asceticism. p. 297 l. 9 for happeness read happiness. p. 295 l. 11 for ascetism read aseeticism. p. 297 l. 20 for experimene read experiment p. 308 l. 19 for conscesness read consci-usness p. 329 l. 24 omit of the p. 356 l. 9 for noble read nobler. p. 365 l. 9 for them read than p. 377 for L-androso read Lombross p. 636 l. 12 for Sankara read Sanskara. p. 404 l. 14 for new read now, for history read history, p. 407 l. 16 for appear read appears p. 444, 445 for Tylor read Tyler. sp. 447 l. 8 omit the p. 450 l. 26 for missioneries read missionaries p. 451 l. 24 for Tylor read Tyler. p. 460 l. 23 for evangelical read evangelic-al. p. 475 l. 28 for atta read and p. 479 l. 10 for have read has. p. 498 for Galations read Galatians p. 536 l. 24 for heinagryphic read hieroglyphic. p. 569 l. 1 for spiritualey read spirituality p. 579 l. 13 for religions read religious, p. 582 l. 1 and 26 for developes and for read developes and far p. 588 l. 3 for strangly read stangely p. 594 l. 7 for as read us. p. 601 l. 27 for apporunities read opportunities. p. 608 l. 6 for furtunate read fortanate p. 619 l. 5 & 8 for bleassed and is, read blessed and in p. 620 l. 24 for ands read and is p. 656 for Hegil read Hegel p. 657 for Russel read Russell

POSITIVE RELIGION.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION.

Modern science, historical criticism and moral philosophy have shaken the religious beliefs of man to their very foundation. Science and history have shown that the accounts of the creation, of the deluge and of physical laws and phenomena, as well as many of the social and ethical ideas, rules and commandments, contained in the Vedas, the Bible, the Koran and all the other books, supposed to be infallible and divine revelations, are not true and right, and that they merely embodied the crude and fanciful ideas prevalent, at the time these books were written, among the semi-civilized nations of Asia and Egypt. The evolution of the species man has been traced to natural causes. The unfathomable and impassable gulf that was supposed to separate man from the lower animals has been proved to be nonexistent. Modern philosophers, moralists and religious teachers are, even in the twentieth century immersed in that old superstition and try to base their ethics on it. Science has demolished the foundations of such philosophy. It is now generally accepted as a fact that the earth was originally a mass of burning gas or other matter, thrown out into space by the sun or other celestial bodies, the intense heat of which probably made all life impossible. Science

Changes produced by modern science and philosophy.

cannot recognize the theory that only once, since that time, fully developed man and other lower animals were created or sent to earth by some supernatural power or by some other agency from some other world and that, since that time, the phenomenon has not recurred. Such theories are not consistent with natural laws or with positive philosophy. Supernatural causes of the existence of man, as distinguished from other animals and plants, have yet to be discovered. The existence of the spirit or the soul in man has not yet been satisfactorily proved. The evolution of man according to natural laws leaves little room for the introduction of a non-material soul from outside, though the evolution of consciousness and of the spiritual powers of man from chemical and physical phenomena, which characterize and accompany pure unconscious matter, is a fact, which science can not ignore but can not explain by any physical and material laws and for which it can find no analogy in the universe of matter.

The change wrought on the minds of all thoughtful men, on account of the discoveries of modern science, has been so great that a very large number of them have been obliged to become frankly and openly atheistic in their belief and most of the remainder, who find it difficult to discard traditional and inherited ideas of religion, in their pitiful attempt to reconcile science with religion, have become deists, pantheists or vedantists and consider that matter is spirit and all that is is God and that there is nothing beyond the physical laws of the material universe.

which is identical with God. The human mind is however unable to discard altogether the idea of a helping God, in its utter helplessness, which is apparent to all thinking creatures, and from this fact proceed the fantastic ideas of God so dear to many philosophers but which only furnish themes for ridicule to rationalists. The greatest philosophers of modern Europe and Vedantist India have come to consider the idea of an immanent God as reconciling all difficulties. There is however, in reality very little to distinguish the idea of an immanent God, as enunciated in modern philosophy, from pure pantheism or monism or atheism. The idea of a personal God is rejected by the great majority of scientists and philosophers. The frankly atheistic philosopher rightly says that if there is no personal God, it is absolutely immaterial whether you call matter spirit or nature immanent God, the distinction being only verbal and that religion is merely a worship of words or of figments of fancy, called ideas, fit only for the followers of Mephistopheles, as is so well described by Goethe. Only a few among scientists and philosophers still persist in their belief in a personal God.

Christian priests and priests of other religions finding scientific proof of their positions difficult, fall back upon miracles and what are called historical proofs. Here again cruel critical historians and investigators have destroyed all the cobwebs gathered by the believers in miracles and religious histories of the miracles.

Scientists and philosophers here come to the rescue of believers, who can find no reason for their

Reason discarded as inapplicable to religion.

belief or who find that their beliefs are opposed to human reason, and say that a rational religion is a scientific impossibility, "the essential elements in all religious beliefs being the ultra-rational sanction which they provide for social conduct."* These scientists and philosophers are as a rule atheists or agnostics. Among the scientists and philosophers, who are also believers, the great majority, Christians, Catholics and Protestants, as well as orthodox, Hindus, have also adopted this position, which though it originated with atheists, has strangely been welcomed by clerics of all religions based on revealed books, to the delight of all non-believers. It is clear that this position destroys the very foundations of religion and precludes all religious thought and discussion. It has made people stick to false history, authority of God-revealed books, incarnations and inspired prophets, demonology, Himalayan Mahatmas and the like, and they try to satisfy their conscience and to convince other men by confidently asserting that reason, which is surely "the roof and crown of things," "the ground of all existence" and the very essence of life, can have no place in religious belief.

As a consequence of the changes thus wrought on the thought of man, in recent times, a very large number, who find it difficult to get rid of the idea of the ghost as the divine person, inherited by them from the first religious man,† have taken to spiritualism, which is the old belief in ghosts

Manufacture
of gods and
belief in necromancy, spiritualism and the like.

* Kidd's Social Evolution p. 109:

† See Herbert Spencer's Principles of Sociology.

which man has not yet been able to shake off, or to theosophy, which is also the old belief in the existence of a few supermen who have never died, and which also probably may have its root deep down in the belief of the spirit accompanying the skull of a dead man found among primitive men,* or in the cult of mummies among civilized Egyptians, the best known theosophical book being significantly named "Isis unveiled." I need not speak here much of the manufacture of gods and the deification of peculiar men still going on in India among uneducated and also among educated classes. It only strengthens the position of the atheistic historians of religion as showing that all gods have in all countries been manufactured by man. These new-made gods of India and their doctrines have found some admirers even among European and American philosophers, who in their desperate attempt to find a God would clutch at even epileptic Indian Sanyasis, some of whom have been made gods in India, as miracle-working manifestation of the true God. Thus the world is on the high way to lose its faith in God, and a blind groping after necromancy, spiritualism and ghost-lore is taking its place, or nature and matter are being identified with God and spirit. The yellow peoples of eastern Asia, who are one-third of the human race, never believed in a personal God and the prevailing unbelief among western scientists will furnish an additional reason to them to stick to their old faith.

* See Herbert Spencer's Principles of Sociology.

Many Europeans also are becoming Buddhists in faith, if not in name.

Changes in
ideas in ethics

In the realm of ethics also, the change has been as great. The rationalists have shown by historical proof that the existing theistic religions have not been of much importance in the development of moral ideas. One of the most popular of Hindu religious books says "I do not know virtue nor vice, whatever Thou, O Lord, residing in my heart makest me do, I do." The opposition between morality and the religion of Christ is considered as an article of faith by many Christians. "Luther" says Moehler, "not only taught that Christ had not come to impart to men a purer ethical code but even maintained that he had come to abolish the moral law to liberate true believers from its curse, both for the past and for the future and in that way to make men free."* The pantheistic Gita and the theistic Srimat Bhagabat of the Hindus say morality must give way to religion. The religion of Mahomed with its absolute fatalism practically says the same thing and has thus not been distinguished for the purity or the excellence of its ethics or its uncompromising insistence on a strict moral life quite as much, as for its stern iconoclastic monotheism.

Antagonism
between reli-
gion and eth-

The history of religion shows that it had its origin in the desire of man to get the favour or to ward off the enmity of supernatural powers or gods. Cruelty and immorality accompanied religious practices of most ancient religions. The savage man's

religion consists in propitiating malignant ghosts with bloody sacrifices. Men, when they became more civilized, made friendly as well as hostile powers in nature into gods and worshipped them in the expectation of reward and to avoid natural calamities. Altars, sacrifices, priests and temples had their origin in this way. Bloody sacrifices, offerings of food, fruits and flowers and dedication of maidens, intended for the pleasure of the gods, and lascivious practices were ingredients of every form of religion, which was nothing better than paying the gods, in the hope of repayment in kind in a much greater measure, either in this life or in heaven. The earth ran red with the blood of sacrifices and the air rang with the shrieks of the victims. The annual sacrifice of children to Baal or Moloch, with his fiery stomach of brass, by the peoples of Asia Minor in ancient times is well-known. The attempted sacrifice by Abraham of his son Isaac, according to the Bible, or Ishmael, according to the Koran, is celebrated every year by Jews and Muhammadans and has become the corner stone of the noble doctrine of obedience to God taught by Christians and Muhammadans. Jephthah, the man of God, sacrificed his virgin daughter to the God of the Jews, who is also regarded as the supreme God by the Christians. In the history of ancient Greece, we find Agamemnon of Mycene and Aristodemus of Messina sacrificed their daughters in order to secure the favour of the gods. The Rig Veda records the piteous cry to the God Varuna of Sunahshepha forcibly seized and bound to the stakes for sacrifice. (1) The sacrifice of their

sons by pious Hindu kings is celebrated in the Puranas. The once rather general practice of human sacrifice to Sakti and in southern India, even to the beneficent god Siva, by princes, powerful men and robbers, in famous shrines is well-known. Tens of thousands of oxen and sheep were slaughtered and offered as burnt sacrifice to the great god Jehova of the Jews in accordance with the revealed Law contained in the Bible : " And thou shalt offer thy burnt offerings, the flesh and the blood upon the altar the Lord. " * The revealed law contained in the Koran enjoins the sacrifice of the Bakrid, in which thousands of cows are annually slaughtered in all Muhammadan countries and specially in India, where it is the source of constant strife and occasional sanguinary fights between Hindus and Muhammadans. Even in the temples dedicated to the moralist Confucious in China, oxen, sheep and pigs were sacrificed. The old Hindu religious books tell us that the whole of northern India was at one time covered with stakes for sacrifices. Two rivers are named, one the river of skins and the other the river of blood, because it is said that the skins of bovine cattle covered the entire course of one of them and another ran red with the blood of sacrifices. Land could not be cultivated among many savage tribes without human sacrifice. It is therefore recorded in the Hindu books that God Himself was moved at this pitiful sight and incarnated as Buddha to put a stop to such cruelty. Indeed, religion had nothing whatsoever to do with morality and mercy at its inception.

Buddha first taught *the supremacy of the moral law above all the gods of the human pantheon and the excellency of disinterested self-sacrifice and mercy.

The ethical idea is a result of evolution in the progress of the human mind. Its growth has been a slow one and subject to many vicissitudes. In India, Buddhism lost its hold and Hindus, while adopting its code of pure morality, stultified it by inculcating that bathing in the sacred rivers, pilgrimages, sacrifices, incantations and feeding of Brahmins in expiatory ceremonies could wash off all sins and secure heaven for men. Later Christianity also inculcated as an article of faith the doctrine that sins could be washed off only by atonement or vicarious sacrifice. The astonishing doctrine laid down by St. Paul that "without shedding of blood there is no remission"† of sin, which had its origin in the bloody sacrifices of the Jews, has been since accepted by all Christians and is the foundation of the dogma of atonement by the blood of Christ. Offerings and specially the best of all offerings, namely that of human blood, was supposed to satisfy the deity and appease his anger in ancient times. Even now, virtue is considered, important, because it may lead to grace. It is by grace induced by sacrifice and ceremony that man is saved. Men are even now purged of their sins by death-bed confessions and religious ceremonies performed by Chris-

*It must be said here that Zoroaster reprobated such cruelty. He is recorded to have said: "The Daevas (gods) and worshippers of the Daevas caused blood to flow like rain water." *Zend Avesta* Bahram Yast,

† Hebrews IX. 22.

tian and Hindu priests.* Indeed, most religious men seem to think, as a rationalistic English writer says, that "one must take part in the religious rites of the community and experience the thrill of religious ceremony even if he disregarded the common moral standard," † if he wishes to be saved. It is a matter of history that many celebrated priests, Christian and pagan, have been celebrated not only for their pious fervour but also for their immoral conduct. ‡ Thus most religious men, not only of India but of other countries of the world also, discarded the lofty ethical ideal inculcated by Buddha.

Naturally modern rationlists say that Christianity and all religions based on the supernatural are antagonistic to pure ethics. The idea of the excellence of the Right, of Justice, of Mercy and of God has been growing with the growth of the human mind. In India, it must be said to the eternal glory of her ancient sages that for the first time in history, the idea was evolved that virtue is its own reward. Goodness had to be practised without any hope of reward or fear of punishment. In Europe, it is only in very modern times that Kant and other philosophers have shown that virtue in its essence is dependent on no extraneous cause or on no motives of reward or fear. There is no motive or sanction for it except that of the supreme law of the human mind, which says thou ought to be good, just and merciful. Godless materialism

* The Baitarini of the Hindus and the sacrament of extreme unction of the Christians are instances of such ceremonies, which are enjoined by all the religions of the world.

† Ethical Religion by Salter. ‡ Ibid.

has evolved an idea of ethics much superior even to the pure code of Christian ethics. It speaks of goodness as the sovereign law of life, first as well as last. It speaks of goodness as being like the artist's idea of perfect beauty, as a reflection of that "light which never was on sea or land." It says that "there is no joy to be compared to that of standing up like a man to our task in this world, there is no joy like the ardour of conflict, particularly when it is not for our own selves only but for the wide aims of humanity, for the higher life of humanity."*

The highly civilized modern man has been evolved out of a type which was wholly bestial. In the order of nature, highly developed animate beings have been evolved out of very nearly inanimate forms of life. Eyes with the sense of beauty of a Michael Angelo and ears with the sense of melody of a Beethoven have been evolved out of what were mere spots on the head. It is difficult to believe that minds like those of Newton and Kant could ever come into existence out of the original all but brainless forms of life, from purely chemical and mechanical causes. The same process has been going on in the evolution of ethics and of the ethical sense.

It has been proved by science, and it is no good breaking our heads over it, that the highest intellectual or ethical ideas have evolved out of very nearly unintelligent and wholly unethical forms of life. Science would not believe that they appeared

on earth in their perfect form, like Pallas Athene in full panoply, from without from miraculous causes. All unprejudiced scientists however, are constrained to admit that it is equally inconceivable that from inanimate matter pure beauty, pure harmony, pure intellect and pure ethics and above all pure spirituality, "the light that never was on sea or land" could be evolved. But evolved they have nevertheless been. Human mind shall till the end of time, attempt to understand this mystery of all mysteries.

When Buddha taught a pure ethical religion and banished the idea of God for a time and impressed on cruel man the impelling law of mercy, the world wondered. But the forces of darkness, of selfishness, of the desire for happiness, of the desire for oppressing the weak, inherent in nature, red with blood, with her cruel teeth and claw, with her law of the survival of the fittest, have been too strong for ethics. India soon shook away the purest religion, it ever had, from her shores. Ethical ideas have had their ups and downs in history. Now in modern Europe and America among the most virile and intelligent of the races of men, truer forms of religion have been growing up. All ideas there are now based on a very sure foundation, namely, the scientific spirit. As long as this spirit will exist there can be no going back and the human mind and the human soul must grow.

Changes in
the ideas of
virtue and
morality.

We have seen that modern scientific investigation has very nearly upset all old ideas about god and morality. The foundations of belief have been shaken. Men good and noble, who relied on the

great and merciful God and regulated their lives by the highest of all standards, are in despair. They are asked to show their God or to prove His existence by evidence, which science will accept, and cannot do so. They find the scientific proof showing that their ethics is ignoble and selfish, when compared with the modern rationalistic ideas of ethics, too strong for them and are dumb with dismay. Rich men, who have hitherto been confident of supping with Abraham in heaven, because of their charities, are told point-blank that the poor have a right to their superfluous wealth unjustly obtained out of their labour and that the charity of persons having superfluous wealth is only an attempt to satisfy their vanity by giving a part of their ill-gotten gains to their victims and thus getting their praise and blessings. Alms-giving, which was considered in all religions as a very great virtue leading to the pleasures of heaven, has been brought down from its high pedestal. Chastity, which required wives to burn themselves with their dead husbands, is no longer considered the highest of all womanly virtues and the *Sati*, who attempts to immolate herself, is punishable in the criminal courts as a suicide. The awful austerities undergone by Hindu and Christian ascetics for heavenly joys for earthly pleasures in another birth are now considered ignoble and ridiculous, to the dismay of the would-be saint.

The idea of sin has undergone so great a change that it is in most respects quite different from the old religious idea. The idea still prevalent among

Change
the idea
sin.

the Brahmins of India that it is a great sin to drink water touched by a low-caste man excites the laughter of all men, even though the pitiful clinging of the Brahmins to their fast vanishing prerogatives may make them impervious to such ridicule. The ideas of sin entertained by Buddhists, Christians and Muhammadans have also undergone radical changes; notwithstanding their revealed books, which anathematize any change or variation in the rules contained in them which are said to have been laid down by the Most High.

The foundations of religious beliefs, which have hitherto been the motive power of good conduct and the hope and solace of man, have been sapped. The millions still go on in the faith of their forefathers. But when scientists, philosophers and critical historians lose their faith in existing creeds; as based upon what they declare to have been proved to be fables about miracles and fanciful gods or upon the supposition that desirable or fanciful ideas and words are real living beings:—when such men become atheists, pantheists or agnostics,—it is no wonder that even the faith of the millions is shaken. This is the reason why the churches are deserted and why there is a general scepticism among men of all nationalities. Indeed it was found during the last European war, as the newspapers of the time told us, that ninety per cent. of the soldiers recruited by conscription of the entire manhood of the allied nations, though they believed in mascots, amulets and ghosts, had little faith in church religion.

Atheism, pantheism and agnosticism are not new doctrines. Thousands of years before Christs, they had been enunciated in India. They were known in Greece and Rome and China. Many of the present-day arguments in favour of the materiality of the soul, such as the beginning of life at fertilization, were known to the ancients. It seems we are coming to a time when the ancient non-believers will triumph. If that were the only danger we might hope that ideas, that were discredited thousands of years ago, would again be discredited. But matters are far more serious now. Arguments of the non-believers are now not mere arguments. They are facts of science. If the basic principles of religions are found to be inconsistent with scientific facts or truths, they may be followed by the unthinking millions for a time, but they must ultimately pass away like pleasant dreams. The modern rationalist not only says that all religions are chimeras but goes further and says, as Buddha did two thousand five hundred years ago, that the idea of gods and reliance on them is a net in the meshes of which the human mind is entangled and that it impedes the progress of man and is inconsistent with effort, and that it is reliance on one's self which alone can work out salvations. They say that the prevailing ideas of religion are inconsistent with the highest ethics and the happiness of humanity as a whole. Is it then true that weak helpless man has no friend upon whose bosom he can place his aching head and upon whom he can fall back, when all is lost, as of a certainty that contingency happens to

every one among living beings ? Is it true that the ideas, which grow out of the human brain, are in reality the very highest ? Is it true that morality can exist of itself, without any sanction, without any motive power outside the human brain and without a supreme ideal ? Are all that man has been cherishing and depending on for thousands of years, all the great and beautiful edifices built up by the laborious efforts of this good and the spiritual among mortals, are all those to tumble down and pass away like the famous temple of the Diana of the Ephesians and like the forgotten imperial cities of Assyria and Babylon ?

Good and wise men, men of noble conduct and high spiritually, men who have regulated their lives as true servants and sons of the living Lord and Father, find all the ideas, with which they have been brought up and with which they have built up their character and on which have been based all their hopes and aspirations, shattered and destroyed altogethher, and they throw themselves on the earth in despair and cry out "O Lord ! where art Thou" ? There are others again who in despair hold fast to false history, infallibility of holy books and prophets and incarnations, demonology and theosophic Mahatmas and the like, and say that reason has no place in religion. But the living being shall always refuse to recognize anything as true, which is not approved by his reason, for without doubt "Reason is the roof and crown of all things, the ground of all existence."

It is the earnest desire and love of truth which does not hesitate to disregard, though with sorrow, the most cherished ideas, if found to be based on fanciful and untrue reasons, that leads to the bright regions of the True and the Real. It is only the utterly noble daring soul, which will see the Lord face to face some day. Many weak minds in the meantime will give up the Lord altogether and not trouble themselves with the great question. The danger is imminent. All thinking men may in despair give up the pursuit of the highest of all truths, like the old fruitless quest of the Holy Grail or of the elixir of life.

In this state of things, it is the duty of every earnest man to consider the great question in the light of modern science and to place the result of his thought before his fellow-mortals. The following pages should be considered in the light that it is possible that there may appear a ray of truth in every serious investigation of the great question. It has been asserted that religion is incompatible with science and philosophy. It is the object of these pages to examine impartially this assertion of a position which is surely one of despair, and to test the ideas and facts of science which the rationalists allege are opposed to religion and God. The book is merely an attempt to find out the truth, which may or may not be successful, but it is published in the hope that it may be of some service to others, wiser, purer and more loving, in their efforts to find the true God, without whom life is surely the "empty dream" of a moment of pleasures and pains ending inevitably in hopeless pain and sorrow.

CHAPTER II.

DIFFERENT SYSTEMS OF RELIGION.

It is necessary for the purposes of our enquiry to consider the doctrines inculcated by the prevailing religions. In matters of religion, it is very difficult not to be influenced by inherited predilections and prejudices and to bear with patience any criticism of the religion one believes in. The task of considering religions critically is thus difficult and disagreeable. But in order to ascertain the truth, it must be done by an enquirer with all the courage, impartiality and forbearance of criticism that he is capable of.

There are three great divisions of religion. The first is that which is concerned with the individual alone. The second is what is enforced by the State or Society upon the individual. The third is merely philosophic speculation.

In primitive society, religion was the cult of an individual and his family. As communities became large, religion assumed the public character which it still retains in all countries. The evolution of a priestly class with leisure and learning led to philosophic speculation which spiritualized the old gross idea and eventually led to religion being considered a private concern of the individual, which the state had no business to interfere with. It is now universally admitted that the influence of society and the state has been paramount in ethics but it has not yet been recognized by all that it has been equally

potent in the matter of religion. The consideration of this question is important in determining the essential elements in religion and also the necessity of its connection with the state.

There is a great controversy in the civilized world at the present moment whether religion is private or concerns the individual in his private life, and is not public, or is an institution, which is public, and as such should be enforced or supported by the State. The controversy is very important as showing how all existing great religions, notwithstanding their claim to divine origin and philosophic basis, are in their essence social and state institutions. The priesthood of all countries has up to the present time insisted upon religion having a public character and upon the duty of the state or society in enforcing it upon its members. The modern republics have all disclaimed the state character of religion. The revolutions in France and other civilized countries of Europe, not only freed man from the fetters of feudal tyranny but also freed the human conscience from the fetters imposed on it by religions enforced by the State. The history of religions will show their true character. Philosophy has glorified and spiritualized religion but its original character has not yet wholly disappeared. In considering the great systems of religion, supported as they are by the philosophy and devotion of ages, this great fact should not be forgotten. The history of the ancient religions, which show their real and state character, and of the growth and development of the idea of a non-racial

god, and of the idea of religion being a concern of the individual, as also of the principle that the State should be wholly secular is a fascinating study. It must be admitted with regret however, that it deprives the religions of our ancestors, so dear to all of us, of much of its glamour of spirituality and its divine character.

From the most ancient times, when any society of men recognized a system or cult, it was because it believed that by such cult, supernatural or superhuman powers could be induced to take care of it primarily and of the individual members, of necessity secondarily, and as such, the king, the chiefs and the state had to get and never hesitated to get the favour of the gods even by sacrificing individual members. All peoples outside a particular nation following a particular cult were considered strangers, aliens, enemies, atheists, worshippers of false gods or devils and forsaken by the true God and destined for hell. The gods in ancient times were gods special to a race. Their cult was inculcated by priests maintained by the state. Thus religion was and has been always considered as a state institution.

A study of the history of ancient religions would show their racial character and that they were parts of the state organizations of all countries. Patient investigators of history have discovered some records, more than 5000 year old, of settled society and religion in ancient times. We find there that Ningirsu, god of the Sumerians, was considered to be the real king of the nation and its leader in war. The Babylonians had Marduk for

their special god. We find Shalmaneser of Assyria about 1260 B. C. destroying Arina for "despising the god Ashur," the god of the Assyrians, and pouring out its dust before the idol. Egypt had her special gods. Cambyses, when he conquered Egypt, killed with his own hand the sacred bull, which was supposed to be an incarnation of Osiris, the Egyptian god, who he fancied caused some misfortune to him. The Jews had Jehova for their special god, who fought for them in their battles and who was supposed to be their real king. Kings were abolished for a time and judges placed in their stead to prove that theirs was the kingdom of God, an idea from which the noble Christian idea of the kingdom of heaven has been evolved. None but Jews however, could belong to their religion or be members of such kingdom. This was a logical result of the idea. Among the Aryan conquerors of India we find that this idea was rigorously carried out. Indra, the god of the Indo Aryans, helped Sudasa to conquer the aboriginal races and destroyed their hundred stone-built forts with his thunderbolt. The jabbering non-Aryans could not be allowed to participate in the worship of the gods of the Aryans. Even now the temples of the gods of the Brahmanas cannot be entered by low-caste people, and a Brahman can not bow before a god set up by a Sudra. Thus originally religion was a national and social institution and god was the special supernatural Power, which presided over the destinies of a particular nation and whose greatness was judged by the victories and greatness of that nation.*

* The Bible very graphically describes the old idea in the Deuteronomy Chapter VII thus ; The Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto himself " Thus shall ye deal with them (the Hittites, the Cananites

As great empires grew, the idea became weaker. The conquering world-emperors like Alexander and some of the Roman Cæzars arrogated to themselves the character of divinity and accepted the worship of subject nations. But as soon as these empires disrupted, the old idea of the national god to some extent resumed its sway over the minds of men forming small communities of the same race, though the rise and fall of great empires, including in their fold numerous subject nations, founded by one dominant race after another, effectually destroyed the idea that the great God could be the special god of any particular race. It may be said that the old gods have all passed away and with their disappearance, the old ideas also have all but passed away.

It further appears that when the nations were ruled by great autocrats, some of them lost their faith in the old gods and imposed the worship of new gods on the people. This was possible on account of the great advance of knowledge and culture and consequent scepticism about the old gods. The good and philosophic Pharaoh Amenhotep IV, better known as Akhenaten, like Akbar the Great in later times, forced on his vast empire about 1400 B. C. the worship of the sun, which he regarded as the universal god. But within twelve years, that cult was swept away and the old gods were restored to their temples by his successor. The last Babylonian emperor Nabonidus, father of the better known Belshazzar,

Jebusites &c). Ye shall destroy their altars and break down their images."
 "Thou shalt smite them and utterly destroy them. Neither shalt thou make marriages with them."

who lived at a time (555 B. C.) distinguished for learning and art, and who was himself a very enlightened prince, disregarded the worship of Marduk and brought in the gods of other countries. The result was disastrous. The powerful priesthood was alienated and they welcomed Cyrus, whose army overwhelmed Babylon and who placated the Babylonians by restoring the worship of Marduk in all its splendour. Buddhism, which owed its birth to the culture and prevailing scepticism of the time, would have remained merely a school of philosophy, if it did not recommend itself to the great king Ajatsatru of Maghada and if it were not later adopted as the state religion by Asoka, one of the greatest and most enlightened emperors of ancient times. Similarly, it is recorded that making Buddhism the state religion of China by early Chinese emperors and later by the great Mongol, Kublai Khan, led to its universal adoption in that country, together with Confucianism and Taoism. Christ preached the advent of the kingdom of heaven dreamed of by the Jews. He declared he was sent for that chosen people of God* and he never intended to establish a non-Jewish religious community. By one of those inexplicable miracles, which have determined the progress of man, Christianity became a religion in which Jews had no part. The adoption by the good and enlightened emperor, Constantine the Great, of Christianity as the state religion of the Roman empire led to its becoming

* "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of Israel." Matthew XV 24.

the world-religion, as it now is. The state supported it as a part of the body politic. It should be here mentioned that the enlightenment and culture of the Romans and the Greeks of the time rescued Christianity from its character of a sect of the Jewish religion and gave it its present philosophic and spiritual character.

When the Roman empire fell, the Popes, who had been originally set up by the emperors still continued to exercise their authority independently of the State. Whenever however, the Papal See attempted to be wholly independent there was contention. When Europe was divided into many independent countries, which did not even acknowledge a nominal emperor, the kings of many of those countries considered it politic to establish Church organizations, independent of the Pope, like the Church of England, supported by the State. In countries where the authority of the Pope was recognized, the State supported the Church.

Like Christianity, Muhammadanism became a world-religion, because Mahomed succeeded by force of arms in making it the national and state religion of the Arabians, whose courage and fanaticism soon conquered for Islam the greater portion of Asia and Africa and a large portion of Europe. But in countries where the entire people did not accept Islam, and there was a conquered unconverted portion, state-craft required the tolerance of the religions of conquered nations.

The great empires necessitated the growth and development of the science of government and state-

craft as distinguished from religious rules. The great statesmen were in the beginning mostly priests. But in course of time, a class of secular officials headed by cunning statesmen arose, who excluded the priests. In China this process was early developed. The Chinese with their intensely practical mind early perceived the intimate connection between religion and the State. Confucianism and Taoism were established there for the purpose of enforcing ethics and stable government. Those religions were established by state officials. The rules of ethics and conduct of citizens as well as the rules of state polity, are essential parts of these religions. The religion of Japan had also the maintenance of the existing government, with the emperor as its divine head as one of its main objects. The religion of Buddha, which obtained a firm footing in China and Japan, was an exotic. Kings and emperors were told by it that they were all poor pitiable men soon to suffer pain and death and should at once seek the path of Nirvana. David and Solomon expected God to give them wealth and women and power. Mahomet and even the ascetic Christ promised worldly joys to their followers. Buddhism alone of all religions eschewed all worldly joys and was wholly unsecular. Indeed, wherever it was established it led to disorganization of society, and as Suddhodana, the father of Buddha, rightly complained, it made princes solitary Bhikkus, all men monks and all women nuns, kingdoms monasteries. In China, the establishment of Buddhism accentuated the difference between things spiritual and things secular, between religion and the state, and strengthened

the system of Confucious. Thus there we had a religion, which was secular and official and, side by side, a religion wholly unsecular.

Thus great empires and Buddhism and other wholly unsecular religious systems and speculations and the existence of religions of conquered peoples, like the Jews and Indians, led to the dissociation of religion from the State. But religion could not exist without the help of the State. Jesus could not be crucified by the Jewish priests without the order of Pilate. Great empires with dependent nations thus led to great changes and anomalies.

India is the best example where the anomaly of religion dissociated from the State exists. When the Muhammadans conquered India and practically stamped out Buddhism by the massacre of the shaven-headed monks congregated in the Viharas, Hinduism supported by a tenacious caste-system, strong in the affections of the descendants of the Aryan conquerors of India determined to maintain their racial superiority and purity, still held its ground. The princes of Aryan origin maintained the Brahmins and the old customs and religious systems, and the higher castes continued in their masterful ways over the aboriginal castes. It was the case of Hindu society and dependent Hindu states maintaining a religious system. When the English conquered the Muhammadans, the mosques and the Imams were supported by the mass of the Muhammadan people. But it was the tolerance of the English that made it possible. The tolerance of the Muhammadan emperors in recognizing Hindu marriages and laws of succession and the

tolerance of the English in recognizing and enforcing the marriage customs and laws of succession of both Hindus and Muhammadans made the peaceful continuance of those systems of religion in India possible. The connection between the state and religion will become apparent when this phase of the matter is considered. There may be very enlightened systems of religion taught by great teachers but if the forms of marriages and laws of succession established by any new system are not recognized by the State and its laws, their existence becomes all but impossible.

As in India, so in all civilized countries, we now find religions, other than the state religion, followed by large communities. This was not possible in ancient or even in mediæval times. The State tried its best, till recent times, to secure uniformity of religion by persecutions, executions, burning of heretics, inquisitions and sanguinary wars. The ancient conquering nations like the Indo-Aryan would not amalgamate with the conquered races and not only allowed them to retain but forced them to stick to their own religions, the State enforcing social institutions based on such religions by special laws.

Proselytising was not allowed by the ancient races, such as the Jews, the Hindus and the like. Even Christianity was not originally intended by its great founder for peoples other than the Jews, who said that he was not sent but for the lost sheep of the house of Israel. Its rejection by the Jews forced St. Paul to resort to proselytising among the gentiles with the wonderful results, which we now see. The establishment of a great world-empire, like the Roman,

which had to recognize many religions, and the eclecticism brought about by contact with men of various religions and by Greek culture and the example of Buddhism, which was then the prevailing religion among the nations of Asia, made it possible for St. Paul to take to this innovation. Mahomet followed the example of Christians but he was deeply imbued with the ancient idea and secured uniformity of religion in the countries conquered by him at the point of the sword, the Jihad, as a Muhammadan writer recently declared, being a fundamental principle of Islam. All eastern Asia became Muhammadan. Only the Hindus resisted. The Muhammadan conquerors were few in number and the Hindu population was vast, and there were also one or two tolerant emperors, like Akbar the Great. But even up to the time of the last great Muhammadan emperor, the zealous and intolerant Aurungzebe, every attempt was made to secure uniformity, as a result of which we now find about 80 millions of Muhammadans in India.

State and
religion in
England.

The history of England and other countries of Europe will show very clearly the state character of religion up to very recent times. When the Holy Roman Empire fell to pieces, the Popes began to exercise over the independent kingdoms of Europe a sort of political suzerainty. The reformation was not only a revolt against the abuses of the Romish clergy but also against the paramount power over kings claimed by Popes. Luther declared that the power possessed by the Pope should vest in the king and the state should control the Church. "The power that was lost by the Papacy was grasped by

Henry VIII in England. The reformed Church by the aid of the State as freely burned and sent to jail Unitarians, Trinitarians and Puritans as the Romish Church." In defending the religion of the established Church against the Pope and the Puritans, some of the greatest philosophers of England were driven to the support of despotism. The freedom of worship and political liberty both went hand in hand. Charles I. lost his kingdom and his life in the struggle and so did Louis XVI.*

With the progress of man in knowledge and the awakening sense of manhood in the servile castes in all countries, groaning under the oppressions of kings and nobles and priests, coercion and degradation of man by nobles, higher castes and priests became increasingly difficult. The fight for freedom has been long and arduous. The freedom of religious belief and popular liberty, which are parts of one and the same right to freedom, were secured by man after unspeakable suffering and bloodshed.

It is now an accepted principle that religion concerns only the individual. Many say religion is only philosophy. However that may be, it is now generally recognized that freedom of religion is the birth-right of man, though the advocates of coercion for purposes of the state are still numerous and powerful. The democratic revolutions in the countries of Europe will soon dissociate the State from religion, with results disastrous to all vested rights and artificial supports to superstitions. The

*See Political Thought in England by G. P. Gooch.

great danger is that the worship of the true God will for a time be jeopardized.

The state character of leading existing religions has been described above to show on what uncertain foundations they stand and that it is necessary to ascertain the real immutable elements of religion, which is surely personal and does not depend upon state aenctions.

The idea of the state character of religion however, is very difficult to shake off. Kant and Hegel attempted to establish the essential relationship between the State and religion. When even priests of all Christian countries, during the last European war, did not dispute the claims of the safety and glory of their respective nations as paramount even over those of truth, purity, mercy and religion, the state character of religion and the hold that the idea of nationalism has now got over men became apparent. The great empires undermined the idea but with their fall and the establishment of small nations, the old idea is becoming strong again. Before we go to the old religions we should therefore consider the new cult of Nationalism which is in reality the old idea based on the primal instinct of self-preservation and desire of domination over the weak, which led to the establishment of societies, kingdoms and religions.

This new cult places the glory and the superiority of one's own nation above all religion and above all moral laws which are regarded as of secondary importance. This idea has got complete possession of the minds of the Japanese and most of

the European nations. They do not care for God or morality but work and nobly sacrifice themselves in the cause of their particular nation.

Religion in primitive ages was a domestic affair. The father or the head of the family was also its priest sacrificing to the ancestral spirits, who were supposed to be with them and with whom the living when dead were to be united by funeral ceremonies like the Sapin-lakarana of the Hindus, and thenceforward to participate in the offerings to the ancestors. The ghosts of the ancestors were the originals of the gods of tribes and nations. When a number of men organised a Gotra or a class or a nation and that class or nation conquered other weaker peoples, they formed themselves into a superior caste, and the maintenance of the caste and class privileges became a divine duty imposed by the ancestral god. When gods came to be worshipped as special gods of a tribe or nation, the glory and pre-eminence of that tribe or nation were considered objects to be sought even by the sacrifice of children and of self. With the advance of enlightenment and scepticism regarding gods, we have now the idea of the Nation in the place of those ancient ideas now considered crude and superstitious.

The preserving of the independence and seeking the prosperity and glory of one's own nation is above truth, morality and God: this is the new code of life evolved with the wonderful organizations of commerce and war in modern times. This idea,—let there be no mistake about it,—is the direct outcome of strong nations dominating over and

making profit out of weaker nations, a process that has gone on from time immemorial and shall go on till the inferior nations, like the Indians and the Africans, raise themselves to an equality with the other nations or, what is more probable, are wiped off from the face of the earth in the struggle for existence, like the aborigines of Australia. Till then, the fight for the possession of countries and slaves or labourers and for commercial advantages shall go on, and the idea of military glory shall engross the imaginations of the stronger races of the earth. If there were no Asia and no Africa for exploitation, there would be no sanguinary wars. Sutherland in his book on the origin and growth of the moral instinct and Haeckel in the *Wonder of Life* have conclusively shown that because of this nationalistic idea, in consequence of which all Christian principles are ignored in the international relations of nations and pure egoism prevails, "every nation seems to take advantage of others by cunning or force and whenever possible, to subjugate them,"* and that "it shows a low level of morality, and the leading nations of Europe and their offshoots (in the United States and elsewhere) must be considered as lower civilized races" (of the ideal divisions made by Sutherland)† In their scramble for colonies, dependencies and commercial advantages, civilized nations would fight among themselves till altruism becomes more general among men and till the weak races become strong enough to defend themselves.

*The *Wonder of Life* p 446.

† The Origin and Growth of the Moral Instinct.

All noble devices for peace, like President Wilson's League of Nations and the mandatory system, have not improved the condition of the weak races. The creed of nationalism, which is glorified in this League for peace will lead to its natural and logical result.

In this struggle among nations, the stronger and the nobler races will triumph to the lasting good of man. But nevertheless, as I shall show hereafter, the strong shall die out of the effects of their own strength and pride, and the descendants of the weak, who may survive, shall become stronger because of the hard conditions of their life and shall ultimately prevail over the weak descendants of the strong. However that may be, though the struggle to predominate over the weak is one of the elemental instincts of nature, there is a law higher and more powerful than it. That law must ultimately prevail. This book is an attempt to find out whether there is such a law. All the systems of religion and philosophy, even the atheistic and the materialistic, are based upon the supposition of the existence of such a law.

The atheistic systems deny that without God such a law is impossible. But if they have established the existence of the law of Mercy, they have done a great service to man. They idealize Humanity and the State and put them in the place of God. Their cults should therefore be briefly considered, before we go to the great religions, specially having regard to the fact that they have the great advantage of being free from many errors and superstitions. Inherited superstitions and the customs of the society

in which they live make it difficult even for the best and most philosophic of men to consider religious questions without prejudice and partiality and without the desire to find excuses and mysterious explanations for them. The positions of the theists, as being free from all such attempts, are worthy of serious consideration. They have at least purified true theism by purging it of the fanciful and ignoble ideas of God as taught by sorcerers, magicians, epileptics, spiritualists, as well as by the prophets and philosophers of ancient times, who were undoubtedly great men but who were handicapped by the imperfect knowledge and superstitions of their time.

Religion of
humanity.

The religion of Humanity is an extension of the religion of nationality, showing all its selfish and obnoxious character. Mankind is considered by its followers as occupying the place of the nation. The positivist considers "Humanity as a self-contained and self-creative being, a kind of finite absolute, which evolves all its properties and engineers all its advance out of the resources of its own nature" and that it is "the only object of religions reverence and love." *Comte also added to the worship of humanity the worship of space and earth. He thought that "the cultus of space and of the earth, completing that of humanity, makes us see in all that surrounds us the free auxiliaries of Humanity." Comte gloried in the positive and would have nothing beyond what were perceptible by the senses. Naturally "he was of opinion that the study of the sun and the moon would suffice", and the study of the "little

*The idea of God by Pattison p. 145.

telescope planets " discovered by modern science was considered useless and a grave scientific aberration. Comte only followed up the Christian idea that "man is the true Shekma," as St. Chrysostom says, which statement is amplified by Carlyle, who says that "man is the visible presence of the divine, and that we are too apt to limit and mechanize the great doctrine of the incarnation which forms the centre of the Christian faith " and that "whatever else it may mean, it means at least this—that in the conditions of the highest human life we have access as nowhere else, to the inmost nature of the divine God manifest in the flesh which is a more profound philosophical truth than the loftiest flight of speculations, that outsoars all predicates and for the greater glory of God declares him unknowable." * Whatever all this profundity of atheistic Comte and Christian Carlyle, who agree in the main, may mean, it is a misnomer to call it positive philosophy. A philosophy, which eschews all positive science and concern itself solely with the actual sense-perceptions and the ephemeral sensual pleasures and which sets up humanity, and woman in special, and space and the earth as objects of worship and that which declares little man as the true Shekma the highest embodiment of all the noble ideas, which constitute the supposed God of the theists, is no doubt very sentimental, poetic and imaginative but is not scientific and is opposed to patent facts and absolutely unreal, and is thus certainly not positive. Life is too poignant, too real and too posi-

*See Pattison's Idea of God.

tive a fact to be an object of dialectic and sentimental philosophy, misnamed positive.

Atheists and materialists say that there is no God and that life is transient but we should make the world happier by our efforts so long as we live. By "happier" is meant productive of more sensual pleasures. The mind is also a sense, *i. e.*, something non-spiritual, according to them. Certainly to some extent they are right in their conclusions. Even if life is transient, it is good to have enjoyment out of it and to make ones self and others happier, even for this short span of their existence.

The creed of utility or Utilitarianism is "the creed, which accepts as the foundation of morals, utility or the greatest happiness principle, and holds that actions are right in proportion as they tend to promote happiness, wrong as they tend to produce the reverse of happiness. By happiness is intended pleasure and the absence of pain; by unhappiness is intended pain and the privation of pleasure; and that happiness is the end of life," and as such Mill says it is indistinguishable from Epicurism, but it also claims "the morality of self-devotion." The utilitarian morality does recognize in human beings the power of sacrificing their own greatest good for the good of others. It only refuses to admit that the sacrifice is itself a good. A sacrifice which does not increase or tend to increase the sum total of happiness, it considers as wasted."* This statement of Mill is rather confused.

The principle of the greatest good of the greatest number, as enunciated by Bentham, who was a

* See Utilitarianism by Mill.

great jurist, was more clear and practical. It is a doctrine which is the corner stone of Socialism and is one which for all practical purposes should regulate the actions of the State and of Society.

Socialism, which is fast gaining ground and will soon dominate the civilized world, inculcates the equality of all men and women, equal rights to the produce of the earth, the removal of great differences in wealth between the very rich and the very poor and the liability of governments to provide comfort, health and education and work for all. It is not necessary for the purposes of the present enquiry to describe the system in great detail.

Socialism.

The materialistic, utilitarian and socialist ideas have led to the increased happiness of the Many. In India and in Europe, as well as in other countries of the world, in ancient times, the proper education of the masses and of women was not allowed. In India the exercise of religion by the Sudra masses was a grievous offence. The punishment which Rama, the most righteous of Hindu kings, meted out to a Sudra, who exercised the religious austerities which were considered to be the peculiar privilege of the Brahmins, was death. The whole scope of the Institutes of Manu and of the Bhagabat Gita is to enforce upon the castes the proper performance of the duties of their peculiar class as laid down in those holy books. A Kshatriya was to obtain salvation by warfare alone. The Sudra masses must remain as serfs under their Aryan conquerors, and the divine law ordained that in the next world they attain to bliss by servitude to the Brahmins and

other twice-born classes in this world and by nothing else. In India, the old idea is still maintained by the Brahmins, who are the vast majority of the educated classes holding high official positions, and Brahmin judges of British High Courts have enforced a lower code of morality in respect of marriage and legitimacy for the Sudras, as laid down in Manu, even in the year 1916. †The position of women also was no better than that of slaves, till very modern times. All this must pass away. In France the iniquitous rights possessed by the feudal lords over the people and the oppressions of the priests were washed away in blood during the French Revolution. In Russia, the same thing has happened. Man has every reason to be thankful for the result.

Modern Europe has recognized the right of all men and women to knowledge and has enforced universal education. Outside India, in all countries, all men have now equal rights to the exercise of the highest forms of religion known among them. Utilitarianism and Socialism have taught that all men and women have equal rights to comfort, freedom and knowledge. The higher castes, the priestly classes, and the philosophers have at last been constrained to accept that the only truly noble ideal of life is the ideal, which is not concerned merely with the salvation of one's own little self or the progress and happiness of his own class or even of his race or country, and which is not engrossed with contemplation and emotion but is based, not only on the imperative necessity of self-culture and the seeking of

*See Indian Law Report 37 Mad. 13 Full Bench.

the advancement and happiness of the individual but also on the higher duties to one's brothers and sisters and neighbours, to the residents of the same town, to the race and nation he belongs to, and to all men of all races and to all living beings.

Materialism, Socialism and Utilitarianism are all based on the old doctrine of Epicurus that pleasure is the Summum Bonum of life, adopted by Mill and other utilitarians. Mill however did not define pleasure and pain. The psychologist, as well as the biologist, would smile at the delusion of the Utilitarian. The nature of pleasure and pain is dealt with in subsequent chapters, from a consideration of which the futility of the utilitarian position will be apparent. Science impartially destroys the cobwebs of theories based on fancies and unrealities of superstitious religions as well of atheistic systems.

We should also here mention the recent attempt made by certain rationalists to establish what are called the Ethical Religion and the Ethical Societies. Ethical religious systems were founded in very ancient times, the most notable among them being Buddhism and Jainism. Buddhism will be presently described. Later Buddhism made morality or Dharma God, but Buddha had no such delusions. Modern philosophers in their anxiety to get rid of the idea of God, which they consider irrational and injurious to the progress of man, have set up morality and humanity as objects of worship in order to satisfy the desire in the human mind to worship something. Ethics and humanity have thus become fetishes. If these philosophers considered the history of ethics

Ethical re-
ligion

and of man, they would find that the ethics of the primitive man was no better than the instincts of the beast and primitive humanity was no better than the aggregate of beasts. The highest ideas of ethics of the greatest of philosophers of modern times, may in time be found to be far from noble. Ethics was not noble in the beginning nor is it noble in itself at any time. Ethics without God is the body without the soul; it is God who gives nobility to it. Man was not in the beginning more noble than the beast or dead matter itself. Ethics is progressing with the progress of man as will be shown later on. Man and ethics are progressing to higher and higher forms in the process of the evolution of the good. This law of progress is not a characteristic of matter and can not be a physical law. Without God its existence is not conceivable.

We have seen how the Nation, Humanity and lastly, morality have been made fetishes to worship. Buddhism two thousand five hundred years ago was the first to inculcate such cults. The worship of Dharma or morality and of Sangha or the congregation, which is very like though not quite analogous to the nation or humanity, was established by the followers of Buddha soon after his death. Godless Buddhism set up idols of Dharma, Sangha and even of Sunya or Nothingness for worship. The modern cults of Humanity, Ethical Religion and the like are only phases of the same phenomenon.

Buddhism.

Let us now go to Buddhism in which rational and universal principles of religious conduct were for

the first time enunciated. Buddha was the first among the ancient Masters to teach a truly human and spiritual philosophy. The salvation of the individual from pain and the meshes of repeated life consequent on desire, as well as the striving after the rescue of all living beings from pain and sorrow, as objects to be exclusively sought in life, were the doctrines inculcated by the great teacher for the first time to a wondering world, which acclaimed him as the Master Physician who alone knew the true remedy for the ills of life.

Buddhists say that people are born, play in their infancy, obtain instruction when they are young, work for their livelihood, marry and get children, spend their time in pleasure, labour, work, crime, benevolence or in literary and scientific pursuits ; finally they are killed or they get ill and die in great pain, some surrounded by their weeping families and some deserted by all. Some lead the life of wretchedness and poverty, some of comparative wealth, some of abundance, most of obscurity, a few of fame. But the entire period is generally not more than sixty years and all come to a close " in a lonely spasm of helpless agony." Bana, one of the greatest of the ancient poets of India, deeply imbued with the spirit of his age, thus describes in poignant language the death of his patron Harsha,* who was one of the greatest conquerors and also one of the most learned and generous princes of ancient times : "Helplessness had

* Harsha was also the patron of the great Chinese pilgrim Fa Hien who describes in glowing terms the charities and good deeds of this prince who was a great supporter of Buddhism though he did not discard the Hindu gods.

taken him in hand, pain had him as its province, wasting its domain, lassitude its lair, broken in utterance, unhinged in mind, babbling in speech, ceaseless in sighs, vanquished by yawning, swayed by suffering, in the bondage of wracking pain."* This is the inevitable fate of the greatest and best of living beings, of beast and man and god, said Buddha. All men however, notwithstanding the many ills of life pitifully cling to it up to the last, and were it not for the loss of all power of thought and memory and feeling, which merciful nature has ordained should precede death, the desperate struggle for life of the rich and the poor and of the happy and the miserable would be awful to behold. This hopeless clinging to the body makes every life a tragedy infinitely sadder than the saddest tragedy ever conceived by any poet. For this reason Buddha laid down as the key-stone of his religion what he denominated as the four noble truths, which should be known before all things, namely, the fact that all are pain and sorrow, what is the origin of pain, what is in reality the cessation of pain and what are the means of destruction of pain. He said that this was the only philosophy worth pursuing.

Buddha spoke truly when he said that life was full of pain and ended in death and his ideal was to know that it was so and to get rid of desires that led to it and attain to the state of non-life. If all life is misery, if happiness is the cause of pain and all end in death, it may be of some importance to attain to a frame of mind, which will make one indifferent to pleasure and pain. But in reality pleasures followed

* Thomas and Cowell's translation of *Ullasa Charita* by Bala.

by pain, for 80 years or for 8000 years, are not of much importance, even admitting with Buddhists that there is transmigration of souls. It is a fact that our pains and also our pleasures are forgotten very quickly. What happened in a past existence, if there be any such, is beyond remembrance and all that really concerns us is what is happening to us at the present moment or may happen to us in the future. All beyond the present is not of much moment and leaves only a faint trace on the mind and is important because it affects the present. The past is naught, the present is everything. It is the *real life* to every living being. The remembrance of pleasures enjoyed, of the plaudits of the multitude, of the triumphs in hard fought battles or in the senate, the enjoyment of wealth, of honour and of love is naught compared to the pleasure of one healthful moment or a night's restful sleep to an old man, who had them all. The remembrance of victories, of past magnificence and of past pleasures would be a cause of misery. Fortunately that remembrance does not leave impressions strong enough on the mind, which is wholly dominated by the present.

Is Buddha therefore right? Are those of his followers, who like many modern philosophers, assert that all life exists for a moment followed the next moment by another life, right? * So far it is true that the present moment to every body is indeed life in its reality. The rest is remembrance or anticipation, important so far as it affects

* The doctrine of momentary existence or *Khanikabad* has recently found expression in the works of Mr. William James, Mr. Weldon Carr and of Bergson.

the present moment. Still is life such an insignificant thing? If so, we need not think much about it or trouble ourselves with God and religion. It is better to think that it is not so. We shall presently see and examine what the teachers of the best known systems say on this, the great problem of life and its permanence, and on the ideals of life. All the primitive religions were concerned with ghosts and spirits of ancestors and how to propitiate them and how the dead were to be comfortable after death. All the advanced religions and philosophies of India and Greece were absorbed in the solution of the problem how to get rid of the pains of life and their recurrence after death. The atheists and materialists of ancient and modern times smiled and even now smile at the systems that are concerned with what would happen after death, and accepting death as the end, they try to give a meaning to life. Buddha saw the levity and the futility of such attempts. He however did not smile. He saw the realities of life clearly and his heart was filled with a great compassion and he truly deserved the description of him by the philosopher Buddha Ghosha that he was "one whose heart had become calm with the highest compassion.* He desired to conquer sorrow and pain, old age, decay and death. Philosophy and morality were the means by which he proposed to attain this end. His was surely the first and greatest of all philosophic religions.

Buddha eschewed God and considered life to be transitory, though he believed in the transmigration

* It is a great spiritual truth, of which only the Buddhists speak of, namely, that compassion makes the heart calm.

of souls. His ideal was a life of purity, utter benevolence to all beings and self-reliance ; and his final goal was to break through all meshes in which the mind is entangled and to attain to the extinction of the fire of desire, the ever-burning fire, of which the manifestation is life with its inevitable miserable end. This idea has made millions of men better and happier. It destroyed for a time the fear of malicious gods and demons and the superstitions and the false ideals, which darkened the face of the earth at the time and which still darken the mind of man.

The logic of the philosophy of Buddhism is still the marvel of the world. Hindus and Christians have all attempted in vain to demonstrate its error. This philosophy of spiritual atheism is a doctrine, which theism has not yet demolished. The sequence of causes which led to life and its inevitable sufferings, which was the great discovery of Buddha, no one has as yet proved to be erroneous. It was the discovery of this law of the sequence of causes of life, which was the great enlightenment attained by Buddha. Later Buddhists, learned in the ceremonial laws and practices of Buddhism, anxious only to avoid killing of animals, and even modern learned admirers of Buddhism and its high morality have practically lost sight of the philosophic basis of Buddhism which determines the real springs of life. This law is fully described in Chapter IV.* The European scientist has evolved the materialistic atheism. But the nobler atheism is the spiritual atheism of Buddha and it is infinitely more difficult of refutation.

Buddha, unlike philosophers, ancient and modern, allowed souls and capacity for salvation to all beasts, slaves, women and Sudras. Woman for the first time in history became the equal of man. She was declared entitled to be a Bhikkuni or a nun and women became Theris or saints, like men. Later Buddhists ascribed the fall of Buddhism to this doctrine, which they said Buddha in a moment of weakness assented to, at the importunity of the gentle Ananda. Ananda was never considered to be fit to become an Arhat or saint, on account of this weakness and on account of his personal affection for Buddha. But the time is coming when he will be remembered with affection as the human man infinitely greater than the hard proud philosophers who despised him.

Hinduism—
Vedantic.

The Vedantic ideal of the Hindus is very nearly the Buddhist ideal with the exception that it believes in the permanence of the soul and its final beatitude in absorption in the Oversoul, which is supposed to be identical with the entire universe, of which the universe is an illusory reflex. It is however, proudly engrossed with the beatitude of the self and is indifferent to the welfare of others, though it teaches that benevolence is necessary for the end sought by it. The Buddhistic ideal, it must be confessed, is more benevolent, and altruistic and indeed is absolutely selfless. The Vedantic ideal is concerned with the self and its emancipation, and the welfare of others is a matter of secondary importance according to it, excepting as it affects the final beatitude of self, which means the condition in which the indivi-

dual soul or self, having cast off its garments of ignorance, assumes its true state of the oversoul or the great Self, the Supreme Brahman.

The pantheistic idea and the idea of immanence, as a consequence of Vedantic teaching, has permeated the Hindu mind with the result described by Pattison thus: "Such a pantheism is indistinguishable from the barest Naturalism. " All in All" said Fichte in another reference, "and for that very reason nothing at all." The lower pantheism, as it may be called, is common in the popular cults of the East, where immanent unity of the divine is little more than the idea of a teeming Nature and passes early into a gross polytheism, whose deities represent and consecrate every natural force and tendency".* This explains how the Vedantic Hindu is a polytheistic idolater. Hinduism also recommends the self-immolation of a widow as the highest virtue for a woman. Millions of wives and concubines have burned themselves with their Hindu husbands and lords in India and Java, with the approbation of the community. Caste, polygamy, unjust treatment of women and idolatry are defects of Hinduism. But it must be conceded by all impartial observers that in lofty morality, purity of domestic life, ascetism and devotion, the Hindus are superior to many nations of the earth.

In India, the ideal of the ordinary Hindu is exemplified by his prayer to his Deity repeated every-day by all pious Hindus: "give me wealth and children, beauty, fame and health and victory over my enemies." Certainly these are more real than al-

* Pattison's Idea of God p. 219.

truism. The Sanyasi or the ascetic Hindu, who has renounced the world and is venerated by all Hindus goes about saying that he is above pleasure and pain and is God himself. His extraordinary penances and physical endurance do not always lead to moral eminence and often end in infamous life, as in the case of the saint Haridas, who was interned alive without any harm to himself for forty days in the presence of Ranjit Singh, the famous king of the Punjab and his French generals.

Most Hindus consider that the Gita lays down the highest ideal of life. It lays down that one should lead a life of indifference to pleasure and pain, performing religious ceremonies and the duties of life without hope of reward. It here approximates the ideal of Kant. The main purpose of the Gita however, seems to be to support the caste system at a period of Indian history when it was assailed on all sides by schismatics, foreigners and powerful aboriginal tribes.* Its followers, though they talk of a sort of devotion, are all Vedantists who believe that their little souls when freed by Jnana i. e. knowledge or Bhakti i. e., devotion, become the Supreme Being itself. The idea of action without desire again, though noble, is unreal and untrue. The sense-organs will not act without desire. The eye can not see when there is no desire to see, the mind can not exercise its function without attention.

* The Bhagavata Gita begins with describing the evils of intermarriages between castes. Its Dharma or religion is the observance of the peculiar practices prescribed for each caste by the Smritis and it declares of that it is better to die than to give up the peculiar practices of one's caste. This text is repeated by pious Hindu of even the untouchable castes with great fervour, forgetful that Dharma in the text has been rightly interpreted by Sankara and other commentators as the peculiar caste duties enjoined by the Smritis.

However, the noble ideal of work without desire deserves a fuller consideration and I shall deal with it and other Hindu ideals later on.

The atheistic Vaishnavas of India, who are half the Hindus of the Peninsula, have got a nobler ideal. Vaishnavism teaches benevolence to all beings and the doctrine of *Ahinsa* or abstinence from killing and animal meat, which was first inculcated by Buddha. It alone teaches that self is of little moment and that to love God is the one object of life.

Here again the atheism deep ingrained in the human mind and impressed on it by the philosophers and strengthened by the prevalence of Buddhism and Jainism for over a thousand years, has moulded this noble theism into forms of the fashionable Vedantism or pantheism. The Vaishnavas are Suddhadvaitas or pure pantheists, Visistadvaitas or modified pantheists, or Dvaitadvaitas, *i. e.*, theists as well as pantheists. But the masses are pure theists. They have no idea of speculative subtleties, though they may sometimes submit to the immoralities of some of their Gurus or teachers, who under cover of philosophic pantheism assume all the functions of God himself, and indulge in the immoralities, which they allege, their god delighted in, for the sake of his beloved creatures.

Popular Vaishnavism early degenerated into gross immoralities and was despised by the Sanyasis, as well as by the followers of the Smrities of the great lawgivers, who opprobiously defined the son of a Vaishnavi as illegitimate. But with all that,

* See text of Devala cited in the Principles of Hindu Law.

the Vaishnavas, who follow Tulsidas, Tukaram and Chaitanaya are the only theists in India, who call themselves servants of the Lord as opposed to the Vedantists, who call themselves Swamis or lords. But unfortunately the learned leaders and philosophers among them hold doctrines hardly distinguishable from those of the Vedantists, as we have seen before.

Theosophy. The Theosophists quote certain Sanskrit texts and say that in worship a person should consider himself as God himself. For sometimes I was in doubt whether such a doctrine was general among Hindus. I have since ascertained that that was surely a doctrine adopted in ancient India at the time of the Hindu revival after the Mourya emperors. The emigrant Brahmins of Java, who on the Muhammadan conquest fled to Bali, have kept up the cult in its purity. When a Pandita there worships, he follows the practices laid down by Indian Yogis, recites Vedic texts, makes various kinds of motions of the hand (Mudras), sprinkles water, and after a short time his body is convulsed and then becomes quiet and he considers himself as possessed by the god he worships and sprinkles water and throws flowers towards his own body. Thus the water used by him becomes *Toya Tirtha* or holy water and the remains of the food taken by him, unseen by strangers and in silence, becomes Amrita or holy food, which is identical with the Prasad of modern Indian Gurus.* This practice of the Brahmins of the island of Bali makes clear the practices of modern

*Essays relating to Indo-China and the Indian Archipelago (Trubner's Oriental Series) p. 99.

Indian Brahmin priests as well as the priests of other religions. Holy water, holy food and the like are thus the relics of the old Saman possessed by his familiar spirit. Vedantism improved upon the old cult, gave it a philosophic garb and taught that the worshipper should consider himself as possessed by or absorbed in the universal spirit. This is considered Yoga. The matter is dealt with in Chapter XI.

Theosophists believe in many gods and in long-lived or immortal supermen possessing supernatural powers, who practically take the place of the personal God whom they generally disbelieve.

Muhammadans believe in the immortality of the soul. The ideal of Mahomed is one of noble obedience to one Supreme God, without a mediator and of constant prayer. It is a rigidly pure monotheism, but unfortunately it yearns after a life of sensual pleasure in Vehest or heaven, a place where sensual pleasures are unending, as in the heaven of the Northmen where there are continuous fight and high revel. Here Buddha's doctrine should prove wholesome. All sensual pleasures are surely preceded and followed by pain.

The Semitic races, Hebrews and Arabians—all sons of Abraham, whose most solemn and universally observed religious ceremony is in commemoration of the attempted sacrifice of his son by the patriarch in obedience to the command of his God—were the only theists on this earth in ancient times. They were certainly the chosen people of the Lord. From them have sprung the stern iconoclast Mahomed and the gentle Jesus, from whom, gentiles more than

the Jews, in the inscrutable providence of God, have learnt a truer theism than was known to the latter. The essence of Mahomedanism is, as is laid down in the injunction in the Koran : " Ye shall not worship any other except God and ye shall show kindness to your parents and kindred and to orphans and to the poor and speak that which is good unto men and be constant in prayers and give alms " * The above is as good a doctrine as can be found anywhere else.

The Muhammadans however are greatly handicapped by their belief in the infallibility of the Koran with its many stories declared in it to be true, and also by the rules which recognize the legality of slavery and the capture of women, the necessity of Jihad or war of extermination against unbelievers, by its faith in eternal hell-fire for all unbelievers in the divine character of the Koran and of the mission of Mahomed, and also by its faith in the last day and in the resurrection of the body and thereafter in exquisite pleasures of the senses to be enjoyed by the believers. Neither Mahomed nor his followers were however abstainers from sexual enjoyment in this life, in the hope of such pleasures in heaven, as has been the case with the devout followers of many religions.

Mahomedanism, as popularly understood, is theistic, but the philosophic basis as given to it by its most learned men and its most devout saints is pantheistic. Mr. Henry John Coke in his recently published book on the Domain of Belief thus describes "the

* Sale's Translation of the Koran.

'La Illahilla Allah' of the Muhamadans: 'There is no God but God' is to all intents and purposes what Palgrave calls it the Pantheism of Force and Act, which is identical with the conception of Heine. It is as fatalistic as the grossest materialism. The full sense of the words, 'There is no God but God' is not only to deny absolutely and unreservedly all plurality, whether of nature or of person in the Supreme Being, not only to establish the unity of the Unbegetting and the Unbegot in all its simplicity and incommunicable Oneness; but besides this the words in Arabic imply that the one Supreme Being is also the only Agent, the only Force, the only Act existing throughout the Universe and leave to all beings else, matter or spirit, instinct, intelligence, physical or moral, nothing but pure unconditional passiveness, alike in movement or quiescence, in action or capacity"*

In other matters also, Muhammadans, when they philosophized, made grievous errors. Women, say some students of Mahomedanism, had no souls according to it.† This denying of souls to their inferiors is a prevailing weakness of men. The European moral philosophers, Christian or non-Christian, firmly believe that all animals, except man, have no soul, forgetful of the fact that their theory, according to the inductive methods employed by science, will lead to the inevitable conclusion that man has no soul also. It should be remembered that during Mahomed's life the denying of soul to women was the

*See W. G. Palgrave's Central and Eastern Arabia.

† Most advanced Muhammadans do not admit the correctness of the accusation.

prevailing idea in most religions. Even the Hindu philosopher considered women and Sudras incompetent to perform religious ceremonies and thus practically denied to them souls of the kind possessed by the noble twice-born male. The Hindu considered birth as a female a grievous misfortune brought about by the many sins of past lives.

Mahomed however, greatly ameliorated the lot of women in the East and gave them rights of inheritance to their fathers and husbands and powers of disposal over their own property, not possessed even now by the women of any other country, not even by the women of Europe. Mahomed unfortunately allowed restricted polygamy and divorce at the pleasure of man alone and the immuring of women in the Zenana. These are blots which the progress made by man since his time has made manifest and which enlightened Islam is trying to remove but is unable to do, because of the belief that the Koran is the infallible word of God, which descended miraculously on earth.

Mahomedanism is also highly democratic and socialistic. There is no distinction between man and man in Islam. King and priest, noble and villain, are equal. Again property is divided among sons and daughters, and in the Mahomedan countries the great differences in wealth prevalent in other countries, is not to be found. No Mahomedan family can expect to be very rich for many generations. Mahomedans are thus true socialists.

Mahomed is accused of having recourse to war and bloodshed for propagating his religion. The Koran

tells us that his neighbours who were idolaters declared him to be insane and hounded him out of his native province discredited and jeered at. The anger of the man was justified and fighting was the only means left to him. Idolatry was exterminated in Arabia and Eastern Asia, the seat of the terrible cults of the worship of Moloch and Baal and Istar. Christ like him was also declared by the Jews as insane as one "beside himself" and possessed by evil spirits. Even he the gentlest of men became angry and denounced the Jews for their unjust and heartless conduct towards him. The Jews however were stronger than the followers of the poor carpenter's son and they seized and crucified him. A similar fate befell Socrates. Mahomet was a stronger man with wealthy and influential men and women among his relations and followers. He was able to make war and succeeded. If he had not succeeded, he too would have been crucified, poisoned or otherwise tortured to death. Those that condemn the warlike measures of Mahomed should consider that he had no other alternative. Then again Mahomet's fondness for women is cast in his face in ridicule. But the conduct of the sweet Singer of Israel, and of all the good great men of ancient times should be remembered. Polygamy was a recognized custom among Jews and even among early Christians. The lot of women was no better than that of slaves in ancient times. It was Mahomet who gave them legal rights, denied in every other system.

Christianity is now the noblest and the most progressive religion of the world. Its morality is

Christianity. probably higher than what has hitherto been evolved among men. It is also a highly spiritual religion. It is such a human religion of mercy and love as was never before known to man. It has laid down a rule of self-sacrifice that has led to noble and saintly life and to the relief of suffering and the increased happiness of man. It is an ungracious task to criticize a religion, which inculcates the purest love of God and of man and whose God calls upon the weary and the heavy-laden among men to come to Him and have rest. But unfortunately erroneous dogmas enforced by the State at the instance of the clergy have led to a serious revolt among the rationalists of Christian Europe and there is imminent risk that man would not only discard the erroneous dogmas but with them all that is noble in Christianity. The main historical facts about Christ and Christianity should therefore be considered impartially.

Christ was a Jew, who claimed to be a descendant of David. He was probably an ascetic saintly Nazarene, who was dominated by the dream of the Jews that the glories of David and Solomon will be eclipsed in the coming glory of the kingdom of the chosen people of God, which would be the kingdom of God, established by the Messiah. Jesus was called the Christ, which means the expected, and was believed by his followers to be the Messiah. Thus when he entered Jerusalem on a colt, the people went shouting before him, "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord. Blessed

be the Kingdom of David that cometh in the name of the Lord."* The Jews however saw no prospect of the restoration of their ancient glory and in their disappointment and chagrin, they discarded him and crucified him. Christianity was rejected by the people, for whom alone Christ said he was sent, and accepted by the gentiles, to whom Jesus forbade his disciples to go (Matth X. 5), but who in their admiration of his pure and noble teachings, gave the go by to his avowed mission, and accepted him as their Saviour.

Christ in his teachings did not depart from old Judaism in the main. He said he was sent only for the Jews and was a strict followers of the Mosaic Law. His noble teachings were based on that. He said: "Thou knowest the commandments: do not commit adultery, do not kill, do not steal, do not bear false witness, honour thy father and mother"†; "And thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself" ‡ "But if thou wilt be perfect go and sell all thou hast and give them to the poor and thou shalt have treasure in heaven and come and follow me;" "And every one that hath forsaken houses or brethren or sisters or father or mother or wife or children or lands for my name's sake shall receive an hundredfold and shall inherit everlasting life." (Matth XIX 29).

Teachings of
Christ.

Christ preached a noble forgiveness of one's enemies and believed in the supreme efficacy of prayer and ascetism. He enjoined his followers not only to love their neighbours but also to love their enemies. Above

*Mark XI. 9, 10. † Luke XVII. 20. ‡ Matth XIX. 18. § Matth XIX. 29

Theism taught by Christ.

all he preached a pure monotheism with all the fervour of Moses and of Mahomet and with the enthusiasm of of a true prophet he proclaimed: "The first of all the commandments is, Hear O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord. And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy strength. This is the first commandment. And the second is like, namely this, thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. There is none other commandment greater than these."* He taught that God was a spirit and should be worshipped in spirit and in truth. A nobler theism it is difficult to conceive. Unfortunately this noble religion as taught by Christ has been clouded by many dogmas, which are considered of more vital importance than the pure ethics or the pure monotheism inculcated by him.

Historical proof.

These dogmas have been defended by great philosophers on esoteric philosophic grounds. But the great majority of Christians say with truth that they can find no reason for them but they are true on historical grounds. By historical grounds are meant the supernatural birth of Jesus, his casting out devils, curing diseases, restoring sight to the blind, reviving the dead and working other miracles and last of all, his rising from his grave after death. These are considered as authentic facts of history and on them Christianity is based. The New Testament is full of accounts how legions of devils were cast out by Jesus

*Mark XII. 30, 31.

and how he gave the power to do so to his disciples. The sign of the cross and the carrying of the crucifix, to which a noble spiritual significance was in later times attached, were considered sufficient protection against ghosts and devils. The priests of the Temple at Jerusalem pretended also to exorcise devils but Jesus was more succesful than they and they therefore accused Jesus of casting out devils by the power of his familiar Bælzæbub and he in answer asked them by whose power they did the same. In ancient and in medæval times, indeed even at the present time, things supernatural and miracles were and still are commonly made the basis of the claim to sanctity and authority of all religious teachers and saints. In India the restoring of sight to the blind and bringing back the dead to life are ascribed to several historical religious teachers, in rather modern, times, like Cnaitanya and Tukaram. Elisha among the Jews also restored the dead to life. Only Buddha among religious teachers despised and condemned all fortelling, healing except by medicine, miracles and everything supernatural. His followers in later times however, were famous for their marvellous miracles, and in Sanskrit dramas we find the Buddhist monks and nuns invested with supernatural powers like travelling through the air. Religion has always been considered as based on the supernatural and thus there is a competition among the followers of religious teachers as to who among them worked the greatest miracles. This is called historical proof. But the rationalists

discard all this and say that if you believe in the divinity of a person because of his performing miracles, you can not make any distinction between teachers of all religions to whom miracles and divine character have been ascribed. The historical proof of Christianity is thus a frail reed to rely on.

The superstitions that have attached to the beliefs about Jesus and the dogmas of Christianity have been considered by the orthodox as essential to theism and this has led to the tendency to discard God with the claim to divinity of Jesus. The rationalists say that the ethical rules laid down by many other religions are as good as those laid down in Christianity and for them Christianity is not required. It is its dogmas that constitute the essence of Christianity and they should therefore be impartially considered.

Dogmas of
Christianity.

The following have been laid down by orthodox Christians as the cardinal doctrines of Christianity:

- (1) There is one God; (2) "In this one God there are three distinct persons, the Father, the son and the Holy Ghost, who are perfectly equal to one another"
- (3). "That Jesus Christ the second person of the Blessed Trinity, the divine word, out of love for us and in order to rescue us from the miseries entailed upon us by the disobedience of our first parents, (Adam and Eve) descended from heaven and became Man in the womb of the Virgin Mary by the operation of the Holy Ghost;" (4). "That by his blood "Jesus purchased for us redemption"* the

*Cadinal Gibbon's The Faith of our Fathers p. 1.

reason for the doctrine given by St. Paul being that "without shedding of blood there is no remission of sin."*

The second and third articles of the Apostle's creed agree with the above and further, removes all doubts and makes all philosophic explanations about resurrection difficult, by enjoining the indispensable necessity of believing in the resurrection of the body. The doctrines of Christianity are thus the belief in three persons in the Godhead, the immaculate conception, the death and resurrection in his proper body of Jesus Christ, the last day of judgment and in the original inherited sin which makes every one by nature always sinful. Christianity believes in the resurrection of the dead after lying in the grave for millions of years ill "the last day." The virtuous are to get their reward in heaven, and the sinful their punishment in eternal hell-fire after that. The inevitable eternal punishment of men, who are all sinful, has been averted by the atonement for them by Jesus Christ, who was the second member of the divine Trinity, sacrificing himself for their salvation which is only obtained by believing in and relying on the mediation of Jesus Christ. It also believes that God is too high for man and unapproachable by him and thus a Mediator between man and God is indispensable. The Christians have also to believe in the observance of the old Sabbath, as being the day of the week on which God rested from his labours of creation some thousands of years ago as mentioned in the

*Hebrews IX. 22.

Bible. The Roman Catholics further believe in the necessity of the worship of Mary, the mother of God. All these are opposed to ordinary human science and reason and Luther was right when he said; "man can not of his own reason believe in Jesus Christ" and many Christians therefore believe that only a few elect are by special grace enabled to believe in Jesus and are thus saved from eternal hell-fire, which is the inevitable lot of the rest of God's creatures.

Christian
dogma of
sin.

The sanction of Christianity is the terror of eternal hell-fire and it is based upon an unreal sense of sin. The Christian preacher is always proclaiming: "Through one man sin entered in to the world and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." 'Adam sinned and died and in consequence, by his offence,' "judgment came upon all men to condemnation." "Christ is the Saviour for he had to die for all sinners." "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and you are saved to all eternity." Adam by eating the fruit of the tree of knowledge, the Christian is taught, brought sin into the world. Now science and positive philosophy are the fruit of the tree of knowledge. The fact of the existence of Adam in a certain year mentioned in the Old Testament and also the idea of Sin being result of eating the fruit of knowledge, cannot but be rejected by Science and Positive Philosophy. Conscious of this, the philosophic Christian supports the dogma by laying down: "The burden of sorrow and the burden of care are nothing to the burden of remorse

for sin." Such is the continuous burden of the sermons of every Christian priest and missionary.

Now it is well-established by scientific historical investigation into the origin and development of Ethics that the ideas of virtue are changing and growing truer, purer and nobler from age to age. A woman, who did not burn herself with her dead husband, or her son, who did not help her to do so, would both consider themselves guilty of great sin and be consumed with remorse. In communities, where thieves and robbers are honoured, there is no remorse but a great deal of righteous self-satisfaction at successful robberies. Where head-hunters are honoured and where no girl will accept a young bravo, who can not produce the ghastly trophy of a human head, a cruel murderer considers his acts with great satisfaction as the acme of virtue. Remorse and satisfaction are thus to a great extent the product of the opinion of a man's neighbours. To say that the burden of sorrow at the want of food and clothing or grief at the loss of wealth, reputation, wife and child, or even at the loss of the emoluments of a priest, is less than remorse at the sin of having told an inoffensive lie is untrue and trifling with the realities of life. If the proposition were true, no police, no criminal courts and no gaols would be necessary.

However that might be, this idea of Sin and repentance has been considered as the base and the noblest of the principles of Christianity. Spinoza was considered by Christian divines an atheist,

because he thought "the gnawings of conscience and repentance "deleterious and evil passions" and that "we can always get along better by reason and love of truth than by worry of conscience and remorse."* Molinas, the founder of Quietism and one of the most spiritually minded of men, was burnt to death by Christians for writing:—"When thou fallest into a fault, in what matter so ever it be, do not trouble nor afflict thyself for it. For they are effects of our frail nature stained by original sin. The common enemy will make thee believe, as soon as thou fallest into any fault, that thou walkest in error and therefore art out of God and His favour and herewith would he make thee distrust of the Divine Grace, thee of thy misery and making a giantiegn of it; and putting it into thy head that every day thy soul grows worse instead of better, whilst it so often repeats these failings. O blessed soul, open thy eyes and shut the gate against these diabolical suggestions, knowing thy misery and trusting in the mercy divine. Would not he be a mere fool who running at tournament with others, and falling in the heat of the career, should be weeping on the ground and afflictting himself with discourses upon his fall? Man (they would tell him) lose no time, get up and take the course again, for he that rises again quickly and continues his race succeeds. If thou seest thyself fallen once and a thousand times, thou oughtest to make use of the remedy which I have given thee, that is, a loving confidence in the divine mercy. These are the weapons

*Tract on God, Man and Happiness Book II. Ch. X.

with which thou must fight and conquer cowardice and vain thoughts." Molinose's relying on the divine mercy was considered heresy requiring the punishment of death by burning.

Now let Christians consider the matter impartially and without prejudice. Sin is defined by orthodox Christians as the transgression of the Law* on the authority of 1 John 5. 2: "Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law; for sin is the transgression of the law". The law in the Bible, as all authoritative orthodox Christian handbooks† tell us means the five books of Moses. The law of Moses includes the offering of blood and flesh of sacrificed animals to Jehova as we have seen before. No doubt Jesus said:; "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy but to fulfill." (Matth V. 17) and "Verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled," and no doubt St. Paul said: "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law" (Rom III. 31), still not even the most orthodox of Christians is now prepared to say that a person by incurring sin by not obeying every "jot or tittle" of the law will be sent to eternal hell by the Lord. The law of Moses so far as it lays down the rules of ordinary morality contains nothing new. These rules existed long before Moses among peo-

Christian
definition
of sin.

* Bible Readings for the Home Circle p. 286.

† Ibid p. 287.

ples more civilized than the Jews under whom they served and Moses simply embodied them in his books. It is the ritual contained in them, the injunctions to offer bloody sacrifices, to keep Saturday as the Sabbath, to circumcise children and the like that constituted "Law" proper. The law of Moses is no longer regarded by any Christian as a perfect code of moral or religious rules. The day of the Sabbath, we know, was changed from Saturday to Sunday by the command of Constantine and the Councils of Nice and Laodicea on the ground as declared by them : "Let us have nothing in common with the most hostile rabble of the Jews".

Sacrifice and
the atone-
ment of sin.

The Bible thus describes how a sin is to be purged: "And the Lord spoke unto Moses saying, speak unto the children of Israel, If a soul shall sin let him bring for his sin which he hath sinned a young bullock without blemish unto the Lord for a sin offering And the priest that is annointed shall take of the bullock's blood and bring it to the tabernacle. (Leviticus IV). "And if a soul sin and commit any of these things which are forbidden to be done by the commandments of the Lord * * And he shall bring a ram without a blemish* * and the priest shall make an atonement for him concerning his ignorance * * and it shall be forgiven him" (Leviticus V. 17, 18.) The Jewish, Christians amplified the idea by the atonement of sins by the sacrifice and blood of Jesus, the lamb of God.

The Jews, notwithstanding the great mercies shown to them, were a perverse people and repeatedly

sinned against the Lord and set up idols and groves and served Baal and Ashtoroth. The prophets of the Bible were the enthusiasts for the monotheism of Moses and their denunciations are all recorded in the old Testament. They all threatened the Jews with diverse ills to be brought upon them by the anger of the Lord and preached repentance and many of them, like Jeremiah, continually prophesied "destruction upon destruction." The last of the prophets before Jesus was John the Baptist, who preached "Repent ye; for the Kingdom of heaven is at hand" and when the Pharisees and Sadducees came to him he denounced them saying "O generation of Vipers who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come"? When John the Baptist was cast into prison, the mission of Jesus commenced. "From that time Jesus began to preach and to say Repent: for the Kingdom of heaven is at hand,"* meaning apparently that the end of the world was near at hand and went so far as to say "Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his Kingdom". Christ and his disciples and all Christian preachers, after their example, have preached to men to repent, to seek the remission of sin and thus "to flee from the wrath to come."

Repentance
of the Bible.

The idea of atonement which is the very foundation of Christianity has a history. It is based on the old idea of propitiating a spirit or angry god by bloody sacrifices, either for getting favours or conciliating him. It appears in the sacrifices before the

Origin
the idea
of
atonement.

great Jehova of the Jews. St. Paul embodied in Christianity the old Jewish idea that without the shedding of blood there can be no remission of Sin. The shedding of the precious blood of the son of God was indispensable for the remission of the sins of men and for reconciling the angry God to them. This strange doctrine, based on the blood offerings of a cruel and superstitious age was made the philosophic basis of Christianity. Inscrutable are the ways of God. From this cruel and superstitious doctrine, has developed the noble idea of self-sacrifice and love of Christianity. God or the Son of God, out of his great love, sacrificed himself for the sins of men. His blood was required for the redemption of men and therefore he is called the Redeemer. The pain and sorrows of other men are less than the pains and sorrows of the Christ, who carried the cross, stumbled on his way to the place of execution, was lashed and jeered at and then had his hands and feet nailed to the cross and made to suffer a lingering painful death. Christians are enjoined to follow Christ and to take up the Cross of suffering. This story of suffering has dominated the hearts of men and women and made them mellow and noble, meek and pure, ready to suffer and to sacrifice every thing, even life itself, for suffering humanity, just as the story of the sufferings of the gentle Sita and the noble Rama have for thousands of years dominated the hearts of the Hindus of northern India. The idea of atonement however has been glorified by philosophers and it has been analysed as meaning at-one-ment, which may mean reconciliation and also may signify

the merging of the individual into the God of the pantheists and Vedantists. But its original significance should not be lost sight of in the mist of philosophic explanations of erroneous and superstitious practices and ideas, so familiar to educated Hindus who support all their old superstitions in like manner.

The Christian idea of sin and remorse, absolution and atonement and the older Hindu idea of sin and expiation by bathing, in the sacred rivers, by undergoing physical pain and expiatory ceremonies, of which payment to priests is a principal part, serve the purpose of frightening into obedience with fanciful terrors the human mind, which in the face of inevitable natural pain, decay and death is always trembling with real fear. The Tibetan Buddhistic monks disguise themselves with frightful masks and exemplify by realistic pictures the terrors of hell in order to put wholesome fear in the hearts of poor sinners. But these ideas, Hindu, Buddhistic, Mahomedan and Christian should be eschewed by every truthful and right-thinking man.

Again the idea of a mediator is very pleasant and convenient to the ordinary mind. But many philosophers find it difficult to accept. The idea of the absolute necessity of spectacles to see the light does not seem reasonable to a modern man. The intervention of a mediator is further fatal to the belief in the existence of an infinitely loving God, who is the life of our life. The insisting on the necessity of an intervening person between man and God by the theists of

The idea of
the mediator.

Europe has made rationalists and socialists discard God altogether.

The idea of the mediator is not confined to making the good Jesus the sole mediator. Priests of all religions, especially of Europe and India, all assume to themselves something of the position of middle men necessary to bring man to his Creator. They hanker for special privileges for themselves. They attempt the perpetuation of forms, rituals and superstitions. They have stood up against the advance of knowledge and have burnt saints and savants. Priests in India enforce slavery. Many, if not the majority of Christian priests also supported slavery and enforced labour. They have preached in favour of the most devastating wars and cursed the enemies of those that paid them, as did the priests of the ancient conquering kings. They have often supported the conquest and even the annihilation of the weaker races by the stronger. The Christian priests have given licenses to great men for breaking the rules of morality and have granted absolution for sins and grave crimes for a payment. Jesus is reported by St. John to have said to his disciples "whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained" (John XX. 23). The privilege was claimed by the Popes and Christian priests as having been transmitted to them by apostolic succession. The Hindu Brahmin priests have officiated at human sacrifices and even now officiate at widow-burnings, whenever they find it possible to evade the British Law. They have taught

the Hindu that bathing in the Ganges, pilgrimages and giving fees to the Brahmins clear off all sins. These priests, Hindus and Christians, placed themselves beyond the pale of human morals and promulgated laws, which they taught emanated from God, which exempted them from the jurisdiction of temporal tribunals. They have given absolution for sins and given sanction to the most grievous crimes and claimed to be intermediaries of the far distant God. Priests of all races, civilized and uncivilized, have also kept up their ancient primitive vocation, by uttering formulas with peculiar intonations laying or propitiating ghosts and curing diseases and sanctifying persons and things by the laying of hands and pouring of water and oil and the like.* They have pretended to foretell future events, to avert the decrees of fate, to bring down rain and to drive off plagues and pestilences. All these pretensions, the priests of all nations shall soon have to give up and they will soon devote themselves exclusively to their proper vocation. The priest or the sky-pilot, as he is so expressively named in outer America, has undoubtedly a divine mission. He has kept the ideas of God and morality before men, who would otherwise have disregarded them altogether. The priest is certainly a servant of the Most High. But he ought to be truthful and ought, like the great Buddha, to condemn all miracles and supernatural and superhuman actions and

* "He that believeth not shall be damned. And these signs shall follow them that believe. In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues. They shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick and they shall recover." (Mark XVI 16-18) Christians consider that their saints alone have these powers. But saints and priests of all religions have these powers reported to their credit.

phenomena and pretensions and not make his living by trading on the fears of men and by condoning evil for a payment. He should also forget that he is paid by Kings and Parliaments and remember that he is a servant of God, who is father of all men and women of all races. The priest will surely not pass away from earth, for he has a divine mission to accomplish, though he must give up the ways by which he now supports himself and his class.

Immortality
of the soul and
Christianity.

It is said that Christianity first taught the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. The truth is otherwise. Most people in western Asia and Europe did not believe in the immortality of the soul. The old Testament in several places denies it. Orthodox Christianity, which has derived many of its doctrines from the old Testament, and the Jews, also denies the natural immortality of the soul. It was its claim that by becoming a Christian one gets immortality that recommended Christianity to the peoples of the ancient world. The apostles preached that Christ actually rose from the dead in flesh giving ocular demonstration of the fact that he could resurrect himself and thus also those that believed in him. The very basis of Christianity is the supposed historical fact of the resurrection of Christ in his proper body and the universally accepted doctrine is that they alone who believe in him and his resurrection have eternal life. St. Paul says: "If Christ be not raised your faith is vain; Ye are as yet in your sins. Then they also who are fallen in Christ are perished" (1 Cor. 16). He further says: "By one man (Adam)

sin entered into the world and death by sin." (Rom. V. 12). The Bible further says: "Whosoever believeth in Him (Christ) should not perish but have everlasting life" (John III. 16) and "He that hath not the son of god hath not life." (1 John 5. 10). and "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life and he that believeth not the son shall not see life; but the wrath of God" (John III. 36.) Indeed the accepted doctrine of Christianity is that "eternal life is a gift suspended on conditions and is to be acquired through Christ alone."

The rationalist rejoices in the agreement of the Christian with him in his denial of the natural and absolute immortality of living beings and rejects the doctrine of the purchase of immortality as unreasonable and ignoble.

Christianity further denies evolution. Henry Ward Beecher, the celebrated American preacher, rightly said that the doctrine of evolution "strikes at the root of all mediæval and orthodox modern theology—the fall of man in Adam and the inheritance by his posterity of his guilt, and by consequence, any such view of atonement as has been constructed to meet this fabulous disaster. Men have not fallen as a race; men have come up. No great disaster met the race at the start." The orthodox Church even now repudiates such opinions.

Christianity thus contradicts science and history and asserts the infallibility of the Bible. The inevitable result has followed. At the National Convention of

The inevitable result of insisting on false doctrines

France in 1793, the Bishop of Paris publicly declared "that Christianity was in every respect a piece of priestcraft which had no foundation in history or sacred truth"*and thereupon the Convention unanimously renounced the belief and worship of God. In 1794 the worship of Reason was introduced at another meeting of the Convention in which Chaumette, a leading Deputy, publicly declared: "Mortals cease to tremble before the powerless thunders of a God whom your fears have created. Henceforth acknowledge no divinity but Reason". All religious men of the time asserted that the truth of the existence of God depended on the truth of the dogmas of Christianity and insisted on the indispensability of a terrible wrathful God, with the eternal fire for the great majority of living beings, of the atonement, of incarnation, of infallible revealed books, and the like. The French people had thus no other alternative but to deny God. Since then scepticism has gained ground in all the other countries of Europe. It was found that during the last great European war not more than 25 per cent of the conscripted manhood of all European countries believed in the faiths of the Churches.

All religions claiming infallibility would produce the same result. Among Hindus, the atheist is not he who denies God but he who denies the authority of the Vedas. The followers of the Sankhya and the Mimansa, which deny God, are not considered atheists, because they do not deny the authority of the Vedas. Mahomedans also can not believe in any idea

* Scott's Napoleon Vol. I. p. 78.

of God or in any scientific truth inconsistent with the Koran. We are all reluctant to give up the beliefs of our fathers and the social rules based on them. The dogmas and practices of religion seem more real to us than the unseen God and it is easier, to deny God than to give up old-superstitions. Kings, priests and nobles also have hitherto arrogated to themselves divine character* and asserted that God and religion stood or fell with them. The first martyr in Scotland, an English priest by name Resby was burned to death for attacking not only the papal and also the feudal system.† The privileges of priests and nobles have been declared as essential elements of religion. God has been described as the God of terrors, in order to frighten common people into obedience and into paths of religion and virtue as suited the special interests of the privileged classes. Common men took their masters at their words and when they became strong enough to shake off their yoke, they repudiated not only their unjust claims but also their God and religion. The people of France were the first to take this course. Kings, priests, nobles and plutocrats of other countries have hitherto tried their best to keep the ideas of the French away from their shores. The Russian revolution and the democratizing of the nations of the earth, as a result of the late great war, have shown that all efforts to enslave men and women for ever are futile. However that may be, in their new found

*The King is the anointed of the Lord and bears a divine character according to Christian as well as Hindu Scriptures.

† See Scott's History of Scotland.

liberty, men are repudiating not only the God of their masters but there is imminent danger of their denying the merciful Lord, who is their father and who is not the special God of any class or sect and the supporter of the systems which enslaved them* Orthodox Christians, Mahomedans and Hindus and and other believers in the infallibility of their sacred books have thus to make their choice and decide whether their ancient dogmas, which can not but be rapudiated, are more of more importance to them than God, the merciful Lord of life.

The spirit of
Christianity
can not be
discarded.

The erroneous dogmas have to be rejected but it must be remembered that the good that is in all religions, especially the spirit of Christianity, can not be discarded. Christianity teaches a noble spiritual theism, sacrifice for others, obedience to the Lord of life and the dignity of suffering pain. Christianity has given a meaning to the suffering of man by the example of the crucifixion of Jesus. Buddha taught the way to get rid of pain. St. Paul taught men to take up the Cross lovingly. The meaning of pain in God's world is not yet clear but in course of time, it will be clear to the spiritualized man. In the meantime, the Christian glorification of it is worthy of respectful consideration.

Christianity again is based on freedom. St. Paul rightly said "where the spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom." Early Christianity did not, it is true, abolish slavery but modern Christians have destroyed it altogether.

The ideal of life as inculcated by Christianity the life of its great pure exemplar Jesus Christ, has made this earth of ours purer and nobler to a degree never conceived before. The world certainly knew before Jesus that it was noble to work and sacrifice one's self for the benefit of others but had little idea of its real significance to life. The great Buddhistic Mahayana Arhat spent his life in solitary meditation or in teaching the importance of things for the salvation of all and abstinence from killing and in indulging in passive meditation on pity and mercy. Sacrifice of self was indispensable for an Arhat, but active and life-long work for others and also sacrifice were not the Buddhist ideal. The Hindu gave food to guests and small bits of food to animals and the "Manes" or the departed ancestors and offered clarified butter to the fire but would not touch a suffering Pariah or a leper. It is the white Christian man alone, who has sacrificed his life in the personal service of the black leper. It is he, who has brought knowledge and freedom to all men without distinction of caste and race. It is he alone, who has taught that man and woman have equal rights. It is he alone who has abolished slavery and has taught that all men are equal and worthy of respect. It is he, who has fought one of the most sanguine wars in history and given his life without stint for liberating the slave.

Christ was a Semitic and did not abolish polygamy, which was allowable among early Christians, but later Christianity made it illegal. It was the

spirit of Christ that made the strong man give up his ancient privileges. To Semitic and Aryan peoples, Jews, Arabs, Indians, Greeks and Romans, woman was only a slave of man, who had the right to take and to discard as many women as he liked for wife or concubine. The idea of chastity was wholly one-sided. It was only the obedience of the slave-girl to her lord, who could kill her legally for infidelity or brick her up alive in a wall, as was sometimes done by some very religious Mahomedan Emperors of Delhi and Nawabs of Bengal. Even now murder of a woman for infidelity is not murder according to the laws of the most civilized nations. Unchastity in man however, is only a venial offence. Jesus was the first to condemn this unequal treatment accorded to weak woman by her strong master. Let the first stone be cast at the adulterous woman by the chaste among the men who want to stone her to death, said Jesus, and the world hung its head in shame. What man is there that has not shuddered at the misery of poor Margaret drowning her baby, the fruit of her so called sin, in the pond, in the modern tragedy of Faust. That is not a mere story. It occurs not rarely, even now in 1920 in this modern civilized world of ours. It is the unforgiving social laws, which have set up a Moloch in the name of chastity to which many innocent Margarets have been sacrificed, while the seducer has been honoured. Millions of widows have been burned, buried alive or stabbed to death in India, in the Indian Archipilego, in ancient Europe, as well as

in other countries, in the name of chastity. Even the merciful religion of Buddha did not put a stop to this awful cruelty. Christianity alone has put a stop to it. It should never be forgotten that it was Christ among the saints of the world, who alone defended the adulteress.

It is immaterial whether Christ or Paul or Constantine or Gregory or Francis, singly or all together, brought into being the spirit and the ideals of modern Christian religion. The best and the most pious men of a religion create the spirit that animates it. The spirit of Christianity has been productive of the most beneficent result. The philosophers of the ancient Hindus and Greeks have no doubt been great thinkers but the result of their teachings have been barren in comparison with the results that have flowed from the teachings of the Jewish carpenter. Do unto others as you would be done by is a precept not taught for the first time by Jesus. It is to be found in the Talmud and in the ancient Buddhist scriptures. Jesus taught it anew and European nations perceived in it a meaning, which not the Jews, indeed not even the Buddhists, could see. By their effort to carry out this precept in their every-day life, the European nations have become the noblest among the nations of the earth. Revolutionary France and utilitarian Europe are now rejecting Jesus and with him, naturally but very unfortunately, the idea of God, for they have been taught that God is no other than Jesus. But the spirit of Jesus can not be discarded. Renan the non-Christian wrote one

of the most loving lives of Christ. Utilitarian Europe has displaced the Christian Trinity by the new trinity of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity. Freedom of thought and action and the good of the many have become the ruling ideal of life. All slavery to the king, aristocrat and priest has been or will soon be overthrown. The toiling millions have awakened to a consciousness of their strength and will soon enforce by their might, what the gentle Jesus did not succeed in enforcing even by suffering crucifixion, that the rich and the prosperous must give up part of their superfluous wealth, earned less by their own efforts than by the labour of their unfortunate poorer brothers, to alleviate the wants of the latter and to give them the ordinary comforts of life and the advantages of medical aid and education. All men, they say, have equal right to God's earth and the rich and the fortunate shall not monopolize it and enclose it for their pleasure and accumulate its profits and spend them in extravagant luxury. This is called socialism of which kings, nobles, plutocrats, high paid officials, and military officers and priests and all settled Government supported by them are so afraid. The ideal of the socialist is the ideal of Jesus Christ, as Tolstoy the non-Christian has abundantly shown. The socialist has however forgotten the fact, because he Christian priests arrayed against him.

With the progress of man higher forms of religion and nobler doctrines have come into existence. All religions, however superstitious, have embodied, in them the rules of ethics prevailing at the

time and enforced by the community and the State, following those religions, and have been of great service to humanity in its progress from stage to stage by teaching it discipline, philosophy, spirituality and devotion. Doctrines and dogmas, even if they are not consonant to reason, may be beneficent, if they are, better than those that are prevailing at a certain stage of human progress. This has been specially exemplified by Christianity.

The erroneous dogmas of Christians would surely pass away, taking away with them, I am afraid, much that is utterly good and beautiful and noble. But the lessons of truly noble life inculcated by Jesus shall endure till the end of time. Indeed so beneficent have been the results of the dogma of the second person of the Godhead incarnate as the mediator and of the dogma of atonement by the suffering and sacrifice of Jesus that one is afraid to question the faith of men, who believe in them and who build up all but divine lives on such faith. But philosophy and science are concerned more with truth than with temporary results, and advanced thought in Europe is now slowly rejecting these erroneous dogmas. It is useless fighting against history, science and Truth. But it should always be remembered that Christianity has served the good purpose of making millions of men follow the ideal of Jesus lovingly and devoutly and of bringing nearer the Kingdom of Heaven, for which Jesus prayed and for which all noble men after him have continually prayed.

The criticism of Christianity and other noble religions is an ungracious and unpleasant work, which may displease the believers in those religions. The seeker after truth however should not be impatient of criticism and should know that there is no finality or infallibility in the judgments of men or angels, and that there may always be something truer than what they believe to be true. In the world of positive science and ethics, this is being exemplified every day. To be satisfied with what we believe to be true and consider our beliefs to be infallible and as the final truth is to bar all progress and to commit moral suicide.

The real object of this book is not to expose and combat the errors and the superstitions of existing religions. The rationalists and the historians will surely and effectually accomplish that work. These errors and superstitions must pass away like mists before the rising sun, with the increasing reason, knowledge, self-respect and freedom of man. The real fight, which theism has to fight, is with materialism, atheistic science and biology and with philosophy, which names nature God and attempts to prove pantheism, monism, pluralism and the like and denies the personal God of mercy and love.

CHAPTER III.

PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION.

We should next consider some of the philosophic speculations bearing on religious belief. Philosophy and religion have been allied to each other from the most ancient times. The priests in ancient times had to be learned in the ceremonial lore and had much leisure and not much wealth,*indeed were often very poor. Learning was confined to them. Their leisure and poverty made them ponder on the problems of life and indulge in philosophic speculation. But it is difficult for man to discard the ideas which prevail in the society he lives in, and further a man finds himself naturally impelled to consider the religious practices, which support him, as reasonable and consonant to philosophy. The ancient Greek, Roman and Hindu philosophers found reasons to support polytheism and cruel and immoral practices on philosophic grounds furnished by pantheism. So great is the partiality of man towards systems which support him that even those Schools of Hindu philosophy, which discarded God, found philosophic reasons for the ceremonial practices of the Vedas. None of the philosophers doubted the divinity of the Vedas. Only Buddha, who was a non-Brahmin, discarded the Vedas and thus had pure reason for his guide.

Philosophy
supports exist-
ing religions.

Among the great Christian philosophers the same thing has happened. The mediæval philosophers were all priests and naturally supported the

Philosophers
and scientists
generally apo-
logists.

doctrines of Christianity. The philosopher Baader said that "every system of morals that is without a Saviour is without salvation; fallen man has not the capacity to re-integrate; himself; hereditary sin, the sin of the Serpent hinders him in this'. He also said that 'the Virgin was taken to the nuptial abode of God for producing Jesus the redeemer'. Christian philosophers as a rule were of like opinion. One is lost in wonder when he finds that Locke and Leibnitz, Kant and Hegel, not to speak of the many philosophers belonging to the Church of Rome and also to the Protestant Churches, indeed most of the great philosophers of Europe, have found philosophic reasons for the reality of the miracles, the immaculate conception, and the rising of Jesus from his grave, and their philosophies purport to establish the dogmas of Christianity. The Universities could not entertain heterodox doctrines, hence philosophy emanating from the professors had to support orthodox doctrines, such as the marvellous mystery of the Trinity, the resurrection of the body, the necessity of eternal hell-fire for all living beings, except the few believing elect, and atonement by the blood of Christ. It must be remembered that hundreds of dissenting philosophers and scientists had their books burnt and they themselves excommunicated and not rarely burnt to death. Long acquiescence in church doctrines became a habit, which influenced the opinion of even the greatest of philosophers in Europe.

Even scientific men have felt the influence of such habit of obedience to the Church. The

greatest of scientists have been unable to shake off inherited religious snperstitions. Newton commented on the Apocalypse and proved that the Pope was Antichrist. In matters religious and such as are supersensual and supernatural, and unseen,—the fairies, ghosts, devils, gins, angels, Mahatmas, charms and incantations,—all men find it difficult to discard the beliefs of their childhood and of their community, and reasons have always been found for the most grotesque opinions, as they can not be disproved by tangible facts, and thus philosophic speculation has been allowed free play in regard to them. What M. Taine says disparagingly of the scientists and philosophers of England only is more or less true also of philosophers and scientists of all countries. He wrote: "In vain have these men genius; as soon as they touch religion, they become antiquated and narrow-minded. They are apologists and not inquirers. They busy themselves with morality, not with truth* *They seek from argument only motives and means for right conduct. They do not love truth; for itself, they repress it as soon as it strives to become independent; they demand that reason shall be Christian and Protestant; they would give it the lie under any other form; they reduce it to the humble position of a hand-maid and set over it their own inner biblical and utilitarian sense".*

The above observations should not be considered as establishing that philosophy is of no use in posi-

* Taine's History of English Literature p. 115.

Religion requires the support of philosophy.

tive religion. Religion has always been supported by philosophy. A man can not live without philosophizing. If the philosophers condemned a religion, it could not exist in ancient times. Now philosophy has a rival in science, and a doctrine, even if approved by philosophy but found by science to be erroneous, may exist for a time but must pass away in course of time. But philosophy has hitherto been of more importance to religion than science. The doctrines of the great religions considered before have all been based on philosophic grounds by the philosophers holding those religions. Their philosophies however, as we shall presently see, generally do not support pure theism. It is not materialism and rationalism that alone are atheistic but philosophy has generally favoured atheism and pantheism with its various phases, which are in reality indistinguishable from atheism, more than theism.

Why philosophers are pantheistic.

The reason is not far to seek. The ancient Samans considered themselves possessed by the familiar spirit or god whom by use of words and gestures and offerings he supposed he could induce or compel to come and serve his purposes. The old priests were their direct descendants. Professor Bloomfield in his learned book on the Atharva Veda in the Encyclopædia of Indo-Aryan Research rightly says that the Atharvanic charms and practices are rooted in Indo-European antiquity. The direct lineal descendants of the Atharvans *in Vedic India and Mazdian Persia were the old Rishis, seers and philosophers of Persia

*They were the priests who by means of Mantras and incantations were supposed to cure all diseases, destroy enemies, compel love and the like.

and India, famous for the subtlety and sublimity of their speculations. Indeed in all countries, the prophets and founders of religions considered themselves as possessed by or as incarnation of the God whose cult they preached*. The philosophers, the descendants of these priests and prophets, when they indulged in high speculations could not free themselves from the old idea and the authors of the sublime Upanishadas declared as the result of their thought the doctrine "I am He (the Supreme Being)". Those among them to whom the idea that weak, suffering, helpless man is God seemed preposterous denied the bold so-called theistic position and declared there was no God. This is what happened in India and also in other countries. Nevertheless all ideas about God and self and religion have been derived from the philosophers, though we common people have interpreted them as suited our weak suffering humble lives and minds in a manner condemned by the philosophers, as will be described hereafter. We should therefore consider with all respect the noble speculations of the wise teachers of men, who pondered over the questions of reality, the nature and constitution of the universe and the mind and of self and God.

The first question we should consider is the question of reality. Reality has had strange meanings given to it by philosophers. The materialistic philosophers say matter is real because it exists in reality.

Reality.

Its meaning.

*The fact that Jesus or Chaitanya and many other religious teachers declared in moments of exaltation that they were God is no imposture but is only the natural outcome of the old habit.

The idealists say that ideas in the same sense are real and go further and assert that they are the substratum of matter which rots and changes, but ideas are immutable. The supporters of naturalism, pantheism, monism and the like say that there is but one substance, whether it is Nature or God, and because it alone in reality exists, it is real, all else being only phenomenal. But in the realm of the absolute or that of true philosophy, as the Buddhists rightly say, that which does not last forever and is changing every moment and is without any permanent meaning or purpose can not seriously be called real and is no better than a succession of dreams or the Maya or the illusion of the Vedantists, of which according to them the phenomenal universe is the result. It is useless saying that the atoms, which constitute the universe are real. They are perennially combining and disintegrating. They are meaningless without the living being, which is affected by these changes. Except in relation to the living being, the ascription of reality to them may be an absolute truth, but that it is an absolute truth can only be asserted by the living being and it is thus true only in reference to the latter. It would also appear that if living beings are mere products of matter and incapable of influencing matter for their purposes, and are only the plaything of matter, they are no better than dead purposeless atoms and can have no true reality.

Ideas are also considered by some to be real and absolute. Dreams and hallucinations, because they really occur, are certainly real facts but to ascribe the philosophic term reality to them is

absurd. Ideas certainly in themselves are meaningless and no better than dreams and hallucinations. They become real in reference to the living being. The phantasmagoria of the constantly changing material universe, as also the phantasmagoria of dreams, hallucinations and other ideas, is meaningless and thus unreal, except in reference to the living being, though their existence may be undoubted.

Again if the living being is no better than a chemical product or an idea or combination of ideas and thus existing only for a few years or for a moment, the ascription of reality to life, considered only as a variation or mixture of matter and idea, is futile and absurd. The Buddhists clearly established this position. Philosophers, Indian and European, ancient and modern, have speculated on reality, on the Sat, the unchangeable, the one substance and propounded naturalism, pantheism and other theories but have not appreciated the Buddhist position which is more philosophic and rational than theirs.

Further the question whether life is ephemeral or eternal is not the only factor which decides the question of the reality of the universe. If life is ephemeral and continually changing, like a chemical product, there is no reality. But even if life be a permanent thing, a living imperishable monad, which in combination with other living monads and outside non-living atoms, as the pluralists say, produce animals as a chemical result,* even then

*The result can never be a permanent entity. It must disintegrate at some time or other into its component parts and cease to exist, whether it is god or angel or man, as the Buddhist truly says.

it is no better than a perfectly baked brick which is supposed to be indestructible. The universe of life and matter will have in that case also no real meaning and thus can not be considered as truly real. If the universe of life consisted of only microbes, or blind deepwater sea fishes or moles, or monkeys or even men incapable of progress, the reality that may be ascribed to it is certainly a spurious reality. It is the ever-growing life, with its growing sense-perceptions and powers of thought, the ever-expanding idea, the evolution of the spirit with the evolution of higher life, that gives true reality to matter and living beings.* The question is, without God is such a result possible? It is clear that dead matter of itself or living monads of their own force can produce no such result. Life depends for its progress on some Entity other than dead matter or living monads. All true reality must therefore depend on the ever-growing life, the ever-expanding idea, the powers of thought, perception and vision becoming continually larger, ethics becoming higher and nobler and the evolution of the spirit, and therefore on the glorious Entity whose existence is necessary for the result. The question of reality is thus of supreme importance.

Here however we find the philosophers strangely indifferent to God and the spirit in the consideration

* See Bradley's *Appearance and Reality* p. 550. Professors Bosanquet and Bradley while recognizing the true character of reality as described above, have however come to a strange conclusion. They say that the separate existence of finite individuals can not be denied as facts of experience, but "it is merely an appearance or illusion due to the importance of our finite point of view and quite unreal from the side of the absolute".

of the matter. The inclination of the philosophers against theism led them to consider the reality of things other than God and spirit. The speculations on the reality of a universe, changing, impermanent, meaningless and purposeless, or of an immanent god, whose Maya or illusion is the universe, in which the philosophers spent their lives, only amused the rigorously logical Buddhist.

The philosophers concerned themselves with the truth and the base of things and they propounded numerous theories about reality, immanence, pantheism, panpsychism and the like and they generally contemned all religions which were based on "the fears and hopes of men". Thus the philosophers, excepting Buddha, were not the great religious teachers. Christ and Mahomet were not philosophers. But the teachings of the philosophers coloured all religious ideas. The priests of all religions dared not challenge the authority of the leading philosophers of their countries who were as a rule the most learned of their brothers.

The six great systems of ancient Indian philosophy and Buddhism are certainly not theistic. Professor Gough and the learned Indian writer Aukhoy Kumar Dutt declared them to be atheistic. The philosophical systems are as a rule concerned with things other than religious. They are mainly concerned with the laws of mind and matter, the constitution of the universe, and of reality. It is this last question of reality, in the sense they understand it, which for the purpose of the present discussion is

important. Pattison rightly says that "unless the objects of religious faith are real, theology is entirely in the air." I would add that unless there is reality in our sense-perceptions, life and the universe, philosophy and science are all "entirely in the air". If every thing is illusory, if God and the universe are unknown and unknowable, if every thing is transitory and phenomenal and thus unreal, the objects of religion are absolutely futile and its practices, comforts and hopes are fanciful.

Words, ideas
and reality.

In ancient Greece and Rome, as in India, the philosophers were engaged in the same investigation about knowledge and reality. Many books have been written and much subtle speculation has been published by the great thinkers of modern Europe attempting to establish that the material and the phenomenal and the sensual are unreal and contingent and relative and that idea or reason or thought is the real and the absolute. The philosophers have thus glorified their vocation of learned speculation by deifying thought, reason, idea, speculation, imagination and dreams. The old sorcerers, medicine-men, prophets, seers, diviners, trance-men and dreamers, of whom eastern people know much, also depended for their position and livelihood on fancies, speculations and dreams. The priest of the civilized man is the philosopher and Saman combined. He contemns his ancestor the Saman, because he indulges in more advanced speculations and imaginings and ponders on the questions of the real and the absolute, but he

has not yet discarded the pretensions of his predecessor, the Saman, of blessing his friends and clients and procuring their prosperity and of cursing their enemies and compassing their destruction by prayers, incantations, formulas and charms. The philosopher has been engrossed with speculations on the meaning and the power of words, on the reality of ideas and on reducing all things to ideas and on establishing that the idea alone is the absolute and the real. The philosophical speculations about subjective idealism, agnosticism, phenomenalism, sceptical relativism pantheism and panpsychism are forms of the process of the glorification of thought and imagination and dreams. There is much that is true, great and spiritual in all these speculations, which have hitherto engrossed the minds of the greatest and the best of the human race, in their attempt to find the absolute, the infinite and the eternal. It is like the quest of the alchemist and the philosopher to find the elixir of life and the philosopher's stone. The alchemist and the philosopher existed together, the former engaged in finding the elixir of life from things perceptible by the senses, the latter in finding the eternal from speculations, ideas, imaginings and dreams. The labours of the former have led to the glorious progressive modern science, which has not given up altogether the old quest but which is now engrossed with things palpable and real and no less marvellous than the elixir of life. The elixir of life will surely lead to a very miserable condition and the man who had it would be

like the wandering Jew miserable beyond words. Science laughs at such quest. True philosophy clearly sees the worthlessness not only of the continuance of the life of a man as he is at present, without further progress, but also of all learned speculations of psychologists and seekers after the absolute and the eternal and of recipes of attaining it at once with the present equipments of the mind and body by certain physical exercises, ceremonies, prayers, verbal charms, austerity, study and contemplation leading to certain standards of purity and wisdom defined by words and considered real.

The main question is whether consciousness, reason and thought are mere results of matter and material force, as most modern biologists assert. In that contingency all philosophy and religion are of no value. This question has overshadowed all philosophic speculations. It will be considered in the chapter on the Mystery of Life. Philosophers who aspire to be God or parts of God, are confronted with the position that they are after all no better than ignoble combinations of matter and their profoundest thought is a result of mere habit. The labours of psychologists and philosophers, when diverted from the position that all is God, to the main and poignant issue whether all is matter, will, like the labours of the old alchemists, lead to results more glorious than the greatest of the achievements of modern Chemistry. The speculations of the philosophers about reality, value and the categories and the laws of the mind, ideas and ethics, contain great

truths incompatible with the positions of the pure materialist and may lead man to the realms of the pure spirit.

So far as these speculations, like pantheism, pancychism and the like, lead to the position of the materialist under a different nomenclature, they should be combated by positive religion.

The question of reality which we are now considering is one of supreme importance. The true meaning of reality has been shown above to distinguish the position of positive religion from that of the pure materialist. The reality of the materialist only signifies actuality. Many philosophers also have mistaken the actual for the real. Reality has a spiritual signification as described above. In the consideration of the speculations described below the distinction should be borne in mind. If the speculations lead us to the real, they are of supreme importance but not otherwise. Let us now go to the speculations of the philosophers about reality.

The real and the actual.

The questions are :—Is life real? Is the self a reality? Are our experiences true? Is the outside world real? And lastly is God real? The philosophers are divided in three classes on these question.

Positions of the philosophers considered.

The first class of philosophers consider that the outside world is true and real and so is our mind. Experiences are effects produced on the mind by an independent material world. The philosophers who assert the representative character of knowledge belong to this class. In this class also perhaps should be placed philoso-

phers like Lange, who says that "experience is the product not of our organization but of that organization in commerce with unknown factors," which are foreign to us and "which partly lay compulsion on us and partly allow themselves to be moulded to our ends."

The second class of philosophers consider that the ideas are the only reality. One of the most notable among them, Berkeley, says that "knowledge is an entirely internal experience and our sense-ideas, are the effect of the immediate causation of the divine will" and the world is a world of pure experiences and denies any real relatedness between nature and mind. The ancient Hindu and Greek philosophers and the modern philosophers, who consider the universe of experience or all separate finite existence as an illusion, belong to this class.

The third class assert that things in themselves are unknown and unknowable. "We know only the mode in which our senses are affected by an unknown something." The Kantian doctrine is that "the ideas of space and time and the other categories are the contribution of the mind in the act of knowing". "Our knowledge is knowledge only of phenomena. The world of experience is either a quasi-Berkeleyan world of sense-ideas connected by the rational bonds of the categories instead of by associational force of custom; or it is the distorted vision of a reality the fact of whose existence is an immediate certainty

present in all our experience but whose nature that experience is essentially impotent to reveal". Kant says that "supposing us to carry an empirical perception even to the very highest degree of clearness we should not thereby advance a step nearer to a knowledge of the constitution of objects as things-in-themselves" Sir W. Hamilton, another philosopher of the same class, says that our science is at best the reflection of a reality we cannot know and the immediate object of knowledge is really an affection of the bodily organism. Kant's position has not yet been overthrown by later philosophers, who have all chafed at his limitations and only tried to gloss them over by doctrines of value and the like.

Hegel's great doctrine also that phenomena are only becoming and that only becoming is matter of consciousness, being and non-being being the two ends of existence, practically denies the consciousness of reality of existing things. It ignores however the fact that becoming includes being. A growing child or plant is becoming something other than what it was the moment before, but it is surely something which has the attribute of being, which is matter of consciousness. Hegel's doctrine is a variation of the old Buddhistic theory of momentary existence based on the undoubted fact that life is progressive and changing and thus is always becoming, but which denies true reality to the experiences of life as being only momentary and thus practically unreal. The word 'becoming' cannot apply to matter and material force or energy to which the modern scientists

under the influence of the philosophers, have given a spurious non-material character, which, though subject to the processes of combinations and permutations, are constant entities according to science. They are therefore real according to Hegel's definition but reality has to be denied to the living being and to the material universe as modified by the living being, which alone are perennially becoming. Thus things that are subject to continuous flux like matter and energy, though meaningless, may be real but the constantly progressive living being assuming higher forms every moment is not real. The position seems strange to the ordinary mind.

Bergson says that the universe is always changing and thus it is not possible to know the reality. The school of Buddhist philosophy who advocated the momentariness of existence asserted that the knower himself was also every moment changing and thus could not know the reality.

Then again it is asserted by philosophers and scientists as a self-evident truth, without any other reason, that in order to enable the mind to know a thing, there must be some process of mediation through something common to the mind and the object perceived and they find it difficult to find any such mediating entity and thus deny the reality of knowledge. Some give a mystic character to such mediation.

Lotze in his *Mikrocosmos* says: "Let us cease to lament as if the reality of things escaped our apprehension; on the contrary their reality consists in

that as they appear to us ; and all that they are before they are made manifest to us is the mediating preparation for the final realization of their being. The beauty of colours and tones, warmth and fragrance are what nature in itself strives to produce and express but cannot do so by itself ; for this it needs as its last and noblest instrument the sentient mind which alone can put into words its mute striving and in the glory of sentient intention set forth in harmonious actuality what all the motions and gestures of the external world were vainly endeavouring to produce." In all this poetic language there is much that is true but the unknowableness of reality is not questioned. The character of being unknown and unknowable of reality and of God is the keynote not only of theistic philosophers but also of agnostics, like Hume and Spencer.

All these speculations about the character of reality have evoked the amusement of pure scientists. Sir Ray Lankester says: "One may regard the utmost possibilities of the results of human knowledge as the contents of a bracket and place outside that bracket the factor X to represent those unknown and unknowable possibilities which the imagination of man is never wearied of suggesting. The factor X is the plaything of the metaphysician and it is this factor X which Herbert Spencer proposed to hand over to religion as an object of worship." Now is it true that our experiences are all unreal and that God is the X of the factor and that religion is concerned only with this plaything of the metaphysician?

It is not the scientists alone who repudiate the speculations of philosophers establishing the absolute unrealty or the absolute unknowableness of all things. Many modern philosophers also have come to see the futility of the speculations about reality of their predecessors. But they will not accept Naturalism. They are trying to modify the older natural Realism "which asserts direct presence of reality to the percipient subject" and the independent existence of the mind and the object of perception by an amalgam of Monism and Naturalism which would obviate this duality. The older naturalism, they say, is defective because it cannot reconcile "the assertion of direct and true knowledge of reality with the undoubted fact of process or mediation." Pattison *says; "The range and quality of our knowledge of the external world, its delicacy and precision depend undoubtedly on the structure of the sense-organs and the nervous system generally. The universe must therefore appear differently to different creatures according to the difference of their equipment in these respects. The development of the special sense out of a general sensibility to contact is an evolutionary commonplace. One creature exhibits a vague organic sensitiveness to the difference between light and darkness. By another, with a rudimentary organ of vision, the difference between the two is clearly perceived; and as the organ is perfected, there is added with ever-increasing precision and delicacy, the

*The Idea of God.

perception of the different colours and the discrimination of their finest shades. Similarly the sense of hearing advances from "a sensitiveness to concussions affecting the whole environment" to accurate localization and the refinements of musical appreciation. Each creature therefore, has its own world, in the sense that it sees only what it has the power of seeing; but what it apprehends, up to the limit of its capacity, is a true account of the environment, so far as it goes. And the progressive development of more delicate organs of apprehension just means the discovery of fresh aspects of the world, qualities and distinctions of its real being, too subtle to be apprehended by the ruder instruments previously at our disposal. There is no explanation possible of the evolution of the sense-organs and of the sentient organism generally unless we assume the reality of the new features of the world to which that evolution introduces us. The organism is developed and its powers perfected as an instrument of nature's purpose of self-revelation." Then he speaks of æsthetic perceptions: "And what is thus asserted of the secondary qualities will hold also of what professor Bosanquet in one place calls the "tertiary" qualities, the aspects of beauty and sublimity which we recognize in nature and the finer spirit of sense revealed by the insight of the poet and the artist. These things are not subjective imaginings, they give us a deeper truth than ordinary vision, just as the more developed eye or ear carries us further into nature's refinements and beauties. The truth

of the poetic imagination is perhaps the profoundest doctrine of a true philosophy." The writings of the modern philosophers as evidenced by the above extract show how deeply philosophy has been coloured by biology. Indeed the materialist seems to have won all along the line. Though all these modern philosophers are believers in spirit and God their definition of them in no way differs from the definition of nature of the materialist. "The development of special of senses out of a general sensibility to contact", "the evolution of music out of "a sensitive-ness to concussions affecting the whole environment," mentioned above, are very nearly verbatim repetitions of absolutely materialistic biological statements. 'The organism is developed and its powers perfected as an instrument of nature's purpose of self-revelation;" fulfilling "nature's purpose of self-revelation," if all this is regarded as spiritual and theistic philosophy, the pure materialist will at once adopt it. Haeckel's theory as propounded in the *Wonder of Life* in no way differs from the theories of the philosophers mentioned above. His militant atheistic Monism is indistinguishable from pantheism or monism of the philosophers of Europe or the Darshanas of India. The facts of biology cannot be denied. But there is a spiritual basis of perception, which is not perceived by philosophy hypnotized by modern materialistic science.

Thus we find philosophers either declare that the outside universe is a mere illusion or Maya or that its real character is unknowable. There are some

who declare that the mind does not know the thing-in-itself, because the universe is always changing, while others say that the mind itself like all existent entities is always changing and unable to know the thing-in-itself. Now if all is illusory and if nothing is knowable, all philosophy is futile and is itself a delusion. Philosophy has a nobler mission than that. Philosophy leads us to ideas and universals and the region of the spirit. It is philosophy which enables science to arrive at universal truths. So close is the connection between higher mathematics and science and philosophy that one cannot but consider Plato right when he would not admit any body ignorant of geometry to the study of philosophy. Philosophy has been dealing with the subtle bases of all things from the most ancient times. That has been its mission. The most ancient philosophers of whom there is any human record were the great King Janaka and the seer Yajnavalkya who composed the White Yajur Veda. We find it recorded that Janaka when Yajnavalkya came before him would ask him what new subtle theory he had come to propound. The mission of philosophy has been to ascertain the subtle elements which unphilosophic persons could not perceive. Philosophy therefore is all-important in science and religion.

Let us see where it would lead us. Leaving barren speculations aside, let us analyse our sense-perceptions and try to find if possible their real components. We have at the outset to accept the position of the philosophers that we are certain of the existence of the Ego and of the non-Ego the idea of which is a concomi-

Analysis of
sense-percep-
tions.

tant of the idea of the Ego. The non-Ego is the outside universe which exists as a real something, composed of objects perceived. These objects can be analysed by science into atoms, electrons and the like. The aggregates of such elements have certain physical properties which are real indubitable facts of nature recognized by science as such and which exist independently of our perception of them. The length, breadth and width of an object are real properties of it. It may also have colour, sound, smell, taste, warmth and the like. They are perceived by the senses and these perceptions are not immutable. If we analyse these perceptions however we may find some real elements composing them.

Colour is the result of light* acting on a substance which absorbs some rays and reflects other rays of certain frequency on the visual organ. The electro-magnetic wave-disturbances are real entities which may in future be further analysed.* The length of these waves, their frequency and intensity can be scientifically and mathematically ascertained and are real. That which distinguishes one colour from another is certainly that mysterious something, the self, the reality of which cannot be denied. But the attribute which produces the impression on it, is certainly in

*Modern scientists say that light consists of electro-magnetic wave-disturbances travelling through transparent media. 'When we say that we see light it means that a light disturbance has reached the space occupied by the eye. When we say that we see a colour, it means that the disturbance has a certain frequency.' When we say that the light has a certain degree of brightness we mean that the light wave has a certain degree of intensity.

the object in fact. Light has no existence as light apart from the eye. Are we to deny the existence of light as a mode of motion on that account? Take heat and sound. Are they not real? The phenomena of sound, smell, taste, temperature, and the like are also effects of certain real immutable physical facts. The attributes of matter, so far as they are known to physical science, are real and not imaginary or dependent on the impression they produce on the mind. All that can be said is that all the attributes and all the substances in the constitution of a thing are not yet fully known.

Colour and sound have been reduced by science to such facts as intensity, frequency and velocity of light or sound waves, which our reason acknowledges to be as real as such facts as one and one make two. There is no room for philosophic mysticism about reality in respect to facts of nature. It is when we go to the impressions which these facts produce upon consciousness that we come to the land of mysteries. The same frequency of light-waves may produce impressions of different colours to a dog to a man, to a hysterical person and to a person with a deranged brain. If that is meant by the unreality of phenomena of the philosophers the scientist will not quarrel with the term but will proceed to investigate the physical differences, which cause the different impressions.

The representation of an object carried to us by our sense-organs, the nerves and the machinery of the brain is certainly not the thing-in-itself in

Real material constituents of sense-impressions ascertained by reason.

its entirety and it is not true that things are what they are experienced, as the Pragmatist says. The percept is however real to the perceiver and also real to all, as the percept of that particular perceiver, but it differs according to the difference in the sense-organs, the nerves and the constitution of the brains of different perceivers. But reason goes behind all such differing percepts of the same thing and transcends all phenomena and illusive sense-perceptions and ascertains the real elements of the thing producing the sense-impression, which are universal and constant for all beings and for all time, being facts of science. This determination of reason can not be a result of combination of matter and material force called energy, however subtle it may be.

Science and biology are every day analysing the constitution of material objects and energy producing effects on the machinery of the body and also the affections of such machinery in consequence of them. The bounds of knowledge are being constantly extended and the effects of matter and energy in concert with the machinery of the body in producing sense-impressions are being ascertained with greater certainty. Materialists say that there is nothing apart from matter and the speculations of the philosophers are all fanciful. Science has done good service by demolishing the cob-webs of philosophic fancy, but even according to its own admissions it has not yet explained the ultimate realization of the impressions. What was considered by the philosophers as spiritual

has been proved to be effects of matter. The region of the spirit is receding with the advance of material science. But the truth is that the reality of the spirit is not becoming more and more improbable but our ideas of it are becoming more and more spiritual with the inroads of matter into the world of ideas and the spirit as hitherto conceived by us.

The analysis of the sense-impressions will become more and more exhaustive with advancing knowledge but they will never be reduced wholly to mere modifications or forms of matter and energy. This analysis takes us beyond the modes of motion and physical affections. The impressions and the images themselves can be reduced to forms and distinctions, the Rupa and Nama of Buddhistic philosophy, and what constitutes their value, which, though not ascertained yet, is becoming clearer and clearer with the progress of life.

Real ideal
constituents
of sense-im-
pressions.

The universe of forms, of colour and sound and the like, of beauty and goodness is not a baseless unreal creation of the mind, called phenomenon by the philosophers. It is not the complement of reality which Lange thus describes : "man requires a completion of reality by an ideal world which he creates for himself and in the creation of which the highest and noblest of his spiritual functions co-operate". What the spirit of man does create will be described later on. But there are ideal entities which are as real as any material objects and are not creations of man's fancy. Points, lines, surfaces and forms are

as real as any tangible material object. They are certainly ideas, though they are found, so far as the living being is concerned, inseparable from material objects, from which however, they can be separately apprehended by the intelligence.

Again the sense-impressions consist of certain emotions which are not immutable. We may analyse these emotional impressions also. Colour, sound and the like produce certain feelings, which are partly the effects of certain affections of the brain and the nerves which can be ascertained by science. They also are partly effects of certain ideal facts such as beauty, ugliness, symmetry harmony and the like, which the mind perceives in the ideal forms of the objects themselves conveyed to it by the sense-impressions and which cause pleasure and pain in consequence of certain laws of existence which are being more and more ascertained by philosophy and physiology.

Symmetry, harmony and the like, our reason is convinced, have independent existences, like frequency, intensity and the like. The perfect symmetry of a circle and its beauty, we are convinced, exist independently of us. Their apprehension however, depends on our sense-perceptions and our sense-perceptions depend on attention consequent on their being agreeable or disagreeable to us. Symmetry, harmony, beauty and the like are apprehended by our consciousness, and we also recognize in such ideas differences and distinctions, which prove their distinct and real existence.

From what has been stated above it seems clear that there is an ideal element in life which is as real as the material but distinct from it, though arising out of and attached to matter, which is very important in the mysterious process of cognition, yet unrevealed. But materialistic biologists deny the existence of the immaterial spirit and assert that the purest intellectual or æsthetic or moral ideas are no better than material entities. The materialist points out that ideas and even life itself can not be found outside matter and as not arising out of matter. The philosopher asserts with equal truth that the pure, non-material, real element in ideas and life can not be denied. The matter requires consideration.

The followers of Kant assert that ideas of time and space are *a priori* ideas contributed by the mind and are no part of material objects of sense, from which they are wholly distinct. Recent investigations have however shown that these ideas and even thought itself would not be possible when certain cells and structures in the brain are wanting. From this fact Haeckel shows Kant's position about ideas of time and space to be untenable. He may be right so far that these ideas are not unconnected with matter or that they can not be apprehended by the mind without the necessary brain-cells. But the conclusion that all ideas and conceptions of ideas are material and results of chemical and physical processes does not follow. The scientist by means of the microscope finds marvellous facts and traces every organ and every function of the living body to their rudi-

Kant and
Haeckel.

mentary forms and confidently declares that the secret of life and thought has been found. They find certain actions of plasms and monera and the like and trace rudimentary forms of what, they call thought, to them. But the question is how could the reason of Newton or Darwin be evolved out of these plasms and monera of their own efforts. Science commits the error of being engrossed with atoms and of ignoring the phenomena attending the highest forms of life. Philosophy on the other hand ignores the rudimentary form of life and the material side of reason and falls into errors of which the scientist takes advantage. But philosophy which deals with the highest forms of thought unmistakeably shows the immaterial side of life and of reason and shows that ideas are immaterial entities attached to matter and thus not wholly spiritual but which are tending to be wholly unattached to matter and spiritual.

The world
of ideas dis-
covered by
philosophy.

The great good done by philosophy has been to discover the world of ideas and forms. It is supposed that it originated with Socrates and Plato. But as a matter of fact we find it to be the chief plank in Buddha's philosophy and the Greek philosophers, it is possible, might have borrowed it from the Indians in the employ of the great Kings of Persia. Plato said that besides the world, of sensible things, ever changing and shifting, there is another world or the world of eternal forms or natures about which alone we can have knowledge properly so called. Plato and Aristotle considered that these were Universals and the ultimate reality in vacuum or void.

Not only the geometrical figures, but abstract attributes of things and ideas like justice, goodness, &c. have been attributed, because of their universality to the universal Mind or God. St. Augustine held that the ideas and forms were the eternal thoughts of God. Locke and Berkely were practically of the same opinion, the latter holding that the ideas of sense were the words of a divine "language" by which the greater spirit communicated with ourselves. This is deifying dead ideas. Hegel put the matter in less mystic language and said that "to think the phenomenal world is to recast it in form and to transmute it into a universal". This is denying that real and universal ideas are part of the world of matter. There has been a great controversy among philosophers whether these ideas were in the objects or in the mind. The followers of Plato said that these existed separately from the objects. Aristotle held that they were parts of the thing-in-itself. Kant held that the ideas of space and time are *a priori* and are the contributions of the mind in the act of knowing. The simple truth is that all sense-impressions are carried to the mind in the shape of forms, which are in the object as well as in the mind.

It is necessary to analyse and classify the various kinds of ideas to arrive at the truth. The world of ideas consists of two main divisions. In the first division fall those ideas that can not be conceived unattached to objects of sense but may be conceived as existing independent of living beings and

Two main divisions—one connected with matter and the second connected with life.

which are fixed and immutable and real. They are cognized by the living being but at the moment they are cognized it is true of them what Lotze said of truths that "we feel certain that we have not created them but merely recognized them". The second division consists of creations of the mind of living beings and of such ideas as depend on and vary with the constitution and the condition of the bodily organs and the mind of living beings and can not be conceived apart from them and which are constantly changing and assuming finer and more spiritual forms and, notwithstanding their shifting character, are invested with true reality as defined before.

Ideas con-
nected with
matter.

In the first division fall, (1) ideas of space and time, including ideas of points, lengths, surfaces and forms and moments and duration in general; (2) mathematical facts, such as one and one make two, and generalizations which lead to the discovery of laws about matter and energy and about the forms of matter, which are ascertained by reason and are immutable and real and are what are called timeless; (3) ideas about relations between objects of sense, such as a place is in a certain direction from another place in space; (4) ideas of motion and succession; and (5) ideas dependent on comparison, such as those of change and distinctions and the like.

Ideas con-
nected with
life.

In the second division fall, (1) all spurious ideas like phantasies, hallucinations, dreams and the like, which are unreal and fanciful combinations of ideas; (2) ideas conveyed by the senses, such as those of colour

and sound and the like, e. g. whiteness, softness warmth, smell and taste, which are considered by some philosophers as abstract qualities and immutable and universal but which in reality are very uncertain, depending wholly on and differing according to the constitutions of the living being perceiving them; (3) ideas of beauty, harmony and the like; (4) ideas of justice, goodness and the like, which as will be shown hereafter are not immutable but are always growing and assuming finer and more spiritual forms; and (5) the idea based on judgments of value.

The ideas falling under the first division are not conceivable except as attached to material objects. As parts of material objects they do not grow or change and are thus immutable, notwithstanding the fact that the universe of matter as well as the human mind is always in a state of flux. Our reason transcends all these changing conditions and ascertains the immutable components of the sense-impressions. But ideas concerning life which fall under the second division are always growing and changing to more spiritual forms, because the subtle elements composing life are always growing and assuming more spiritual forms.

Difference
between the
two.

Ideas of points, lines, surfaces and forms of material object, even such things as ideas of circles and triangles are immutably real. Even ideas of relation, such as a certain town is north of another town, are not conceivable except

as appertaining to the idea of the entire country between the two towns and containing the two towns. Ideas and space and succession and all relative ideas may be immutable and real. Here the mathematician, who denies reality to ideas, because they are relative, does so because he ignores philosophy. These ideas are real and can be conceived as existing independent of the human mind.

But when we go to ideas of beauty or ugliness of forms, harmony and discordance of sounds and the like, we find that they depend on the mysterious thing life, which makes use of pure ideas attached to material objects like lines and forms and facts of matter and energy, such as ideas of frequency of light-waves, to its own peculiar use. Such ideas connected with dead matter and ideas which concern exclusively the living being, such as justice and goodness, are always growing and becoming finer and more spiritual, as life is becoming finer and more spiritual. Some of these ideas are considered by philosophers to be based on feelings and emotions. That is only partially true, for in that case they would not become finer. But the principle, which really governs them, is that which governs life, namely the principle which makes the living being judge of values of all impressions affecting it and which makes it grow and become more and more spiritual and which thus gives it true reality.

The consideration of the ideas of space and time is very important to religion. Space and time have

both been called God by some philosophers.* The speculations of religious philosophers often centred round these ideas. To all godless philosophy also they have been of paramount importance. We have already considered what Kant and Haeckel thought about them. Let us further consider them here.

Time and space.

Some eminent physicists and mathematicians headed by Dr. Einsteins have only last year propounded certain theories about the character of space and time and have propounded the theory that time and space have only a relative existence depending on motion, and all thought and all existence are in the amalgam time-space. Mr. Morell thus describes this recent doctrine:

The doctrine of relativity.

"Being immoveable this all-pervading space possesses neither form nor time that we can imagine. We apprehend its existence as a necessity of our reason but can not comprehend it. The relativist however denies, at least claims, that we can know nothing of absolute space in the Euclidean sense of a line that goes on and on straight into eternity. The nearest he gets to infinity is visualized in our symbolical heaven, wherein all horizons are curved; and past, present and future are but reflections of man's personality that vanish like his shadow when his presence departs". Speaking of time he says "this second or interval between the before and after is what we call Time." "Transition or motion makes all the

* Dvupitā or Zeus of the Indo-Aryans and Mahakala of the ancient Hindus are instances. Even so late as the eighteenth century, the Cartesian Malebranche asserted that the idea of extension or space could only belong to God.

difference to things, whilst the second of time is our mental measure of the space into which we squeeze five miles in one case and five thousand miles in the other. Thus time and space are two aspects of the same thing, transition or time-space" "Transition is the vortex centre around which all phenomena which constitute our existence revolve. If it were not for transition, we should not and could not be. Thus we realize that change, the measurable alteration of one part of the Cosmos relative to another is an essential "thing" and we know that from the most minute particle, the electron, whirling within the atom to our great Sun, all things are undergoing a colossal change, a never-ending transition. We see how different the real is from the apparent, if we look out upon the expanse of nature in the quiet of restfulness of a star-lit night. Nothing suggests movement save the measured tick of the clock; but that even beat reminds us that a second hence, every part of the universe will bear a different relation to every other part"

"Of the fact that what we call the objective reality of Nature exists we are as certain as we are that the subjective reality of our own mind exists, though great is the mystery of the relationship of the one to the other, since it embraces all things including all space. Existence has so to speak nowhere else to go. It must consequently be fixed and absolute and can not be relative, because there is nothing apart from itself to be related to".*

*The Graphic. December 27. 1919. † Ibid.

"Time is the fourth dimension * * Energy practically creates everything that has mass, that is material. Centrifugal energy propelling a body increases or reduces it, distorts and twists it." "Time added to the lines of the fixed and still Newtonian cube is to visualize motion and makes all the difference. The lines curve towards the great centre of energy and the beginnings of motion are as everywhere, represented by a curved line. Now no particle, be it atom or sun, is known to follow a straight path. An apparent straight line is revealed by the microscope to be a succession of curves".

Another disciple of Dr. Einsteins, Mr. De Sitter has gone to the length of estimating the "vast cycle which our world would take in this universe". He puts it at sixteen million light years. "At the end of this period it recommences its long journey like the recurring decimal, repeats it over and over again. This is the infinity of Relativity. Existence thus becomes a vast cycle of events, the real nature of which we do not know, except they are capable of mathematical measurements. The universe of things goes on and on whilst being carried along in the vast swirl of energy and space-time back to where they are now"*

The above extract will show how the scientist is in deep waters when he ventures into the sea of philosophy. It is surprising to find that many scientists assume that science repudiates God. The writer of the above without any data makes the surprising inference that existence "embraces all things including

*The Graphic. Dec 27. 1919.

time and space" and "has nowhere else to go" and must be fixed and absolute and can not be relative, because there is nothing apart from itself. The theory of relativity is not intended to disprove God. It does not even disprove the truth of the theorems of Euclid. The fact that the straightest line that our pencil can draw shows under microscope that it consists of numberless curves does not disprove the fact that the straight line exists. It is futile saying that the circle and the geometrical figures of Euclid do not exist and that his theorems are not true. Euclid dealt with ideas and therefore Plato very truly said nobody could be a philosopher without a knowledge of Euclid. The ideas of Euclid are psychological that quite as much as they are mathematical.

Relativity
and scepti-
cism.

What is the value of this doctrine of relativity ? It is after all the old doctrine of momentary changing experience in the modern scientific garb. The scientist says all over ideas of things in space and time are only relative and that reality is unknowable. The Buddhist doctrine was more comprehensive. Sceptics like Pierre Bayle held somewhat similar opinions. They held that we are far surer of the external world than of ourselves as we are recreated every moment and do not know whether we are still the same. The relativist only puts a new aspect to the doctrine by saying "that a second hence every part of the universe will bear a different relation to every other part". There is little difference between changing and bearing a different relation. But though the material world may be every moment changing and its parts

become different relative to one another and though the impressions it carries to the mind may be changing from time to times according to the state of the brain and the mind, we find that our reason can analyse the changes, transcend them and ascertain the true and the real. If it were otherwise all science and all philosophy would be futile and life a mode of existence in which all the senses and the brain go wrong and carry to the mind only wrong impressions. Notwithstanding all the changes and the transitoriness of the material universe and of the living being, there is such a stable basis connoted by the changes themselves and such reality in both that true knowledge is possible.

Our consciousness is convinced of the ideas of space, of form, of line and of the point and the materialistic scientist finding the fact very inconvenient wants to whittle it away by a cloud of words. Though the whole theory of Dr. Einstein's is based on the relativity of all things and ideas our scientist needs must go to the region of the absolute and the unrelated of the philosopher, who denies the personal God and adopt all his speculations which are surely not scientific. Again the scientist attempts to prove that time is the fourth dimension of space, because the idea of time is relative, brought about by motion or force. The idea of time is strictly a pure idea, though dependent on the motion of material objects. If you say that time is the fourth dimension of space, you may as well say that comparison and reason are the fifth dimension of space. Words can not destroy ideas or the truth.

In these modern speculations, the old philosophers seem to have won all along the line. The old Puranas and speculative philosophy of India propounded a doctrine that after 4320 millions of solar sidereal years all the gods and other living beings and material objects will be destroyed and renewed, and the modern scientific mathematician has calculated after sixteen million light years the whole universe "recommences its long journey and like the recurring decimal, repeats it over and over again".

The old Pan-
ranic idea.

An Indian may feel proud that the speculations of his age-old philosophers, so long ridiculed by Europeans, are adopted by the newest science, and the modern scientist may also congratulate himself on the fact but it is difficult to resist the smile which such speculations naturally give rise to. However that may be, our scientist has unconsciously mentioned a fact which is undoubtedly scientific which agnostics and pantheists and the like, whom he apparently follows, will not like to adopt. Speaking of space he says "we apprehend its existence as a necessity of our reason, but can not comprehend it." This is what the theist as opposed to the agnostic and the pantheist and the like says of God as an entity, which is distinct and separate from the thinking living being, being an object of his apprehension which he is able to apprehend, the idea apprehended becoming clearer and fuller with the progress of the powers of life, but which he can never fully comprehend. The scientist has done good service by proving that all elementary ideas con-

nected with the universe of matter and life can only be apprehended but not comprehended. We do not deny space and time nor ignore them in our activities in ordinary life because they can not be comprehended. It would be foolish to do so. It would be equally foolish not to regulate our lives on the basis of the reality of God, because we cannot comprehend Him.

The controversy about the ideas of space and time between idealists and materialists brings to light a very curious position. Consistent materialists, who are panpsychists or monists, assert that the entire space is filled with matter or variations of matter and immaterial space or void does not exist and can not be conceived. Idealistic philosophers, who are pantheists, also assert that there is no void and all is God. All is one substance, God or matter, and there is no void is the position of all monists, materialists, pantheists and panpsychists. If therefore there be any void space, all these speculations are conclusively refuted. It is certainly possible that there may be space beyond the solar systems, beyond the milky regions, where there is no other or any variation of matter. Even if it be true that if there be vacuum around atoms of matter they rarefy and at once permeate it, still the space occupied by it exists. It is scientifically possible and true according to all the rules of inductive logic that perfect vacuum can be produced and exists in fact. Even if it can not be produced, its existence is certainly possible and does surely exist as distinct from matter or any thing else. Further our consciousness is

convinced of the fact. We are convinced that a point, a line, a surface and void space between two surfaces exist. The idea is absolute and not relative. Our consciousness can not conceive it to be otherwise, notwithstanding the sophistries of philosophers that the things-in-themselves do not exist in space and time as reality, or of the mathematicians that ideas of space and time are only relative. A learned materialistic biologist, who is a monist, in discussing the matter asserted that there was no void space and if there were any, all his theories would be untenable. The pantheist would also be driven to the position that if there be any void space not pervaded by God, his theory would be untenable. Thus the positions of the materialists, monists and idealistic pantheists depend on the existence or non-existence of void space. The Eleatics held the existence of a vacuum to be inconceivable and denied the reality of motion, since motion was impossible without a vacuum. All scientists and philosophers who agree with the Eleatics that there is no void space must also agree with them that there is no motion. Professor Russell in his recent book on the problems of philosophy thus sums up the result of modern philosophy and mathematics: "The attempt to prescribe to the universe by means of *a priori* principles has broken down" and also "logic presents many kinds of space as possible apart from experience."* That the void space exists or what is tantamount to the same thing for the

* Problems of Philosophy p. 230, 231.

purposes of the present argument, that the existence of void space is possible is true according to all the rules of science and inductive logic and further can not be denied by consciousness. Thus all these theories of monists, materialists, pantheists, panpsychists and the like are absolutely untenable.

In regard to the idea of time also curious results follow from the present day speculations about it. Kant says it is *a priori*. Haeckel says that this theory is false and the notion is a result of material experiences of the human brain. It is certainly not separable from material experiences or facts of motion. It arises from one material phenomenon happening after another. We have no experience of it apart from these phenomena. When there is no life to experience the phenomena of nature, there is no time. Whenever there is such life, there is time. But to be sure it is possible that when there are no phenomena and no experienced time, the fact of time may exist. If the last man ceased to exist just after winding up a clock, the clock will surely go on recording time. Time would exist even if the entire universe consisted only of dead stone. The pure materialist says that time is only a property or a phenomenon accompanying matter and has no independent existence. The pantheist and panpsychist likewise says that time is an accompaniment of life and the all-pervading One pervades it who is its essence and reality as He is of the material universe. Most pantheists assert that the idea of time is a relative one and has no reality or is a delusion, and to the

absolute unconditioned One, there is no time. But the fact remains that even if there were no life, there would be time. Like void space, time exists independent of all other entities.

Ideas of time
and space how
derived.

It should be remembered here that experience provides us only with the idea of space as the content of material objects of experience. The idea of time is also provided by the sequence of physical phenomena. These ideas are not derived by the mind from its own resources independent of experience. It is the idea of this space and this time which the machinery of our brain conveys to the mind. The sequence of phenomena is impressed on the brain matter and its recollection, repetition and comparison comprises the idea of time. The idea of space is similarly derived from the affections of the brain matter by the outside material world. In regard to these, Haeckel's objection to Kants' doctrine is undoubtedly well-founded and in regard to these Einstein's theories also are applicable. We have no experience of void space, Sunya or nothingness. Nothing or not-anything is apparently a figment of the brain, a mere word-creation without any reality, like a sky-flower. But void space is something, of the existence of which we are indubitably conscious. From the idea of space as the content of material objects of experience the idea of void space is derived. The mind obtains the idea from its ideas of the phenomenal world but only by transcending them. The void space our consciousness is convinced is something real, though it is not anything in experience.

Similarly absolute time independent of sequence of phenomena is a reality, of the existence of which we are convinced.

This power of transcending the world of experience proves the spiritual element in life. Philosophers deny God as existing apart from the world of experience. Some of them assert with truth that if he is like the objects of experience, he is no God. Others assert that God can never exist apart from the universe of experience. The analogy of void space and unrelated time shows that these positions are untenable and that our mind may transcend experience and that it is not impossible that our consciousness may recognize the reality of God as apart from all experience, like void space. God may be the content of all things and may yet be not anything of experience. There is no analogy between life and matter. There also cannot be any analogy between the Lord of life and of the kingdom of the spirit and the world of experience. The process by which the idea of absolute void space and time are produced is however the process by which all spiritual ideas and ideas of God may be obtained.

Analogy between the idea of space and the idea of God.

Life and matter exist in space and time. But they are real entities independent of time and space and of the new mathematical amalgam space-time, just as space and time may exist independent of matter and life.

Goodness, justice, beauty and the mathematical and scientific truths also exist independent of space

and time. They are correctly described as timeless by philosophers. The pure Spirit is independent of space and time. The so called immanent god of the pantheist or nature or substance of the monist and all phenomena can not exist independently of time and space, for time and space are integral components of their conception. It is enough to show that the un-personal immanent god or nature and time are inseparably connected. The true God is above that. He is beyond space and time. The growing powers of man have enabled him to have some very imperfect idea of subtle entities like time and space, goodness and beauty and also of God. With further growth of spirituality the living being will know more.

We find three great and marvellous realities all intimately related to but still quite distinct from one another. The first is the great surging ocean of matter, with space and time, producing millions of solar systems and engulfing them again in its dark abysses, with its forces electric or magnetic or of other kinds constantly producing kaleidoscopic changes and the marvellous phenomena of motion and of sound and colour and the like. But this ocean is dark and dead and meaningless in itself. The other reality is marvellous beyond words. It is the ocean of life with its innumerable grades and species, with its deformities and deficiencies in the same species, with its senses and perceptions, with its pains and sorrows and pleasures and delights with its evil and good and with its reason and wisdom. This throbbing, striving, growing, decaying and dying life is the most marvellous reality

Three marvellous realities, matter life and spirit.

in existence. It alone can recognize the ideas arising out of matter. It alone gives meaning to the great ocean of matter and to all ideas. Further it creates the great and ever-growing ideas connected with life. It alone creates beauty and melody, grandeur and terror, justice and goodness and all the phenomena appearing in nature. Without it the material universe as well as the world of ideas is something nothing. Above all these, is the realm of the spirit. That transcends the rest. That world is slowly unfolding itself in the great ocean of life. Its reality is proved by the fact that all ideas are becoming finer and more spiritual with the progress of life which is an undoubted fact. But all these are related and connected, though utterly distinct from one another. That most marvellous relatedness is no part of their essence, as otherwise they would be but one substance, which our consciousness is convinced, they are not. How is this relatedness explained except by reference to an Entity, who transcends all these realities which have meaning and are real only in reference to Him, as we shall show hereafter.

There is a fundamental difference between the universe of matter and its laws, with the forms and ideas attached to them, and the universe of life and ideas attaching to it. The former are fixed and immutable. The latter are always leading to new creations in the ideal as well as in the material world. It is true as the philosophers say that we do not create but merely recognize the timeless physical laws and the ideas of space and time and the combi-

Creative
power of
life.

nations of matter and the like. But in the realm of ethics, æsthetics and of the spirit, it is otherwise. It is not even true of the generalizations made by the intellect, which are always becoming more general and universal with the increase of knowledge and the powers reasoning. The artist creates the picture of a dragon or a unicorn or a double-headed eagle, which does not exist in reality. He also may draw the picture of a woman, whose beauty may surpass that of any daughter of Eve. He may build a Taj Mehal, the like of which never existed before. That conception of beauty is something above anything found in the artist's experience in such cases. A musician may compose music, which never existed before. Out of the discordance of the so called music of the savage man has been produced the glorious melody and harmony of the civilized man. In morals also, the rules supposed to be divinely ordained and immutable by most philosophers, the same process has been at work. Having many husbands and lovers, as all investigators of primitive human society tell us, was the glory of a woman. Theft, deceit and murder were glorified among men. The idea of chastity of the Hindu Suttee was created by man out of primitive unchastity. That idea of chastity is now giving way to a truer idea of chastity. Truth, honesty and love of one's neighbours have taken the place of deceit, theft and murder as virtues. Even now the primitive instinct prevails in times of war, when deceit, robbery and murder are glorified by the most civilized of nations as virtues. But with all that, the glorious ideas of ethics

have been created by man and are becoming more and more glorious with the progress of life. Man has created new plants, new fruits and new flowers, not found in nature before, by his knowledge and power of generalization, which has made him master of some of the secrets of plant-life. Thus we find that newer and still newer entities come into existence,—things which are not developments of old things nor mere creations of the imagination and are as real as any physical fact.

The living being has also the power of bringing into existence keener and even newer senses and structural modifications of his own body enabling him to think better and feel better. The power of creation shows the freedom of the living being. Life connotes freedom. Freedom is the essence of life and distinguishes it from matter. Life is growing out of matter and has but progressed but little on its way to the realms of the spirit. Thus the living being seems absolutely bound by the shackles of matter and its laws. Its freedom however is shown in all essential matters. Our experiences arising out of the material world are, as Lange says, "the product of our organization in commerce with something foreign to us which "partly lays compulsion and partly allows itself to be moulded to our ends".* Our experiences are limited not only by the physical facts, of the material world but also by the world of ideas which lay compulsion on our consciousness, and the fact of such compulsion proves their reality and also the reality

Freedom
indispensable
to progressive
life.

*See Lange's History of Materialism.

of the entity so compelled. But that part in the process of our experience, in which physical facts as well as ideas are moulded by the Ego to its ends, belongs to the realm of the spirit. There the freedom of the living being becomes manifest. The act of such freedom proves the reality of the ideal universe and of the spirit. There we are conscious that a newer and more glorious universe of ideas and of the spirit is being created, which is real and is not the creation of our imagination.

This creation of a universe more glorious and more real than the universe of matter and energy which is the essence of the universe of life is not possible for the living being to accomplish of his own unaided efforts. The idealistic philosophers of Europe and India believe in the power of the living being to create a world of illusions out of its own substance, like the web woven by a spider, in the expressive language of the Indian philosophers. But how is it possible for this humble living being to create a newer and more glorious universe than what he was born in?

The living being transcends itself and all his environment, transcends the universe of matter in which he is born and also the world of ideas, ethics, æsthetics and wisdom in which he finds himself. The fact of such evolution and never-ceasing creation of more glorious forms of life and ethics and æsthetics and wisdom proves an Entity transcending life and matter, without whom the fact would not be possible. He is real as the result of the glorious evolution

Power of
the living be-
ing transcen-
ding itself im-
possible wi-
thout God.

described above flows from Him, and further He alone gives true reality to life and all things real.

But this result is not wholly brought about in a miraculous manner. It is not possible for a living being to transcend itself of its own unaided effort, but the result is not also possible without conscious strenuous effort. All dependence on another and lack of effort lead to parasitism and degeneration, as biologists truly say. Free determination of what is good to it and conscious strenuous effort to attain it are indispensably necessary to life for progress and to avoid degeneration.

We therefore find that in life itself there is a principle, which enables the living being to appreciate the value of perceptions, feelings, ideas and of all other things to itself in reference to self-preservation, reproduction, preservation of the species and above all its further progress and attainment of higher life, which last, as we shall see hereafter, is even more important to life than self-preservation. The dominating factors in life are this appraising of values of things and the desire and the necessary effort to obtain what is of value to it. The principle in life mentioned above however contradicts the main doctrines about perception of the materialistic as well as of the idealistic philosophers.

Hume, as well as Berkeley, is of opinion that the first elements of knowledge in simple perceptions are received by us passively. The fact, if true, would prove that life is wholly material, the sense-impressions being

only reflections of the outside world as on a clear sheet of water or a mirror, or that all is one Substance, identified by the pantheists with God, which has the aforesaid characteristics of matter. Knowledge thus becomes only an affection of one form of matter produced upon another by some mediating mode, like attraction, existing in both. The doctrine is not distinguishable from that of materialistic biology, according to which all actions of living beings are merely the result of habit which is produced by continuous contact of one kind of material force and which is like the effect of a dent produced in the wheel of a machine which produces a jerk or disturbance leading to pleasure or pain. This again is the old doctrine of of Sanskara of Buddha. But the living being though

practically dominated by habit is still capable of making a choice and freeing itself from habit inherited and ingrained in its nature. It is the process of discrimination which manifests itself in what is called attention. The idealistic and materialistic doctrines described above are wholly untenable. There can be no passive perception. Without active attention, there may be physical actions like unconscious cerebrations produced by habit and past impressions but there can be no real and actual perception. The eye can not see and there can not be what is called sense-impressions, without attention. There can be no sense-impressions on the organs of a dead animal nor can there be any sense-impressions on the living being animal without attention. It is this active principle in preception and knowledge that

Attention.

proves the immaterial spiritual element in life. Then again there can be no attention without interest induced by desire.

Desire is at the very root of existence and the appreciation of value, as the philosophers call it, which produces interest and desire, is at the root of the evolution of the higher species. It is this desire with which the Hindu and Buddhistic philosophers were solely concerned. The world of "Values" of Kant and the modern philosophers is a great and startling advance upon the old philosophy. It affords an explanation of the fact of the evolution of higher life. Here philosophy and biology meet. Ancient philosophers ignored this doctrine of values. But modern European philosophers have not also appreciated the full spritual significance of the Buddhist and Hindu-doctrine of desire.

Desire.

Appreciation of value, desire, interest and attention in psychology have real importance in practical science. The connection between ideas and the senses and objects of the senses is one deserving of the attention of the philosopher as well as of the scientist. Biology cannot afford to disregard psychology. The actions in the physical body, which modify it, are not mere molecular motion but they are induced by desire. Light, acting on what are called certain pigment grains, which constitute the rudimentary eye, it is said, produces the fully developed organ of vision, but it should not be forgotten that without the desire to see, inherent in life, neither the pigment grains nor the eye would be there nor would

The effects
of desire.

the eye see at all. Indeed the eye of a living organism, when it does not exercise the power of vision as the consequence of lack of desire to see, as in the case of parasites, disappears in course of time. Again seeing means the reducing of the material gross body to universal ideal forms. Hegel describes the process in philosophical language when he says: "To think the phenomenal world would rather mean to recast it in form and to transmute it into a universal." But seeing and thinking are not possible without attention consequent on desire. The desire to see thus means the desire to realize the inherent ideas of form, and their realization gives satisfaction for causes yet all but unknown.

vision
between de-
sire and sense
organs.

Aristotle propounded the doctrine, in Pattison's words, "of the First Mover operative in the universe as desire or love and so through the quest of satisfaction and self-completion drawing all things to itself." Though this is an imaginative statement, it contains a deep truth found on an analysis of life. The Buddhistic doctrine is that the ideal forms are invariably accompanied by the evolution of the sense-organs and the objects of sense. The Hindu Yoga philosophy of Patanjali says that the idea of form produces the eye. The connection between the idea of form and the eye and light, and the reason why satisfaction is obtained by merely seeing and thus realizing the spiritual ideas, through which impressions of material objects are conveyed to the mind, are mysteries which are real and must be investigated by scientists and psychologists and

the quest may lead us nearer to the sources of life and deeper into the realms of the spirit.

The ancient Hindu idea is that life is based on desire. The truth of the doctrine is difficult to deny. But what is desire? In the rudimentary forms life, we find a property in the organism to maintain its own constitution intact. In the higher forms we find that developing into what is called the instinct of self-preservation and reproduction. Desire, pleasure and pain have been based on such instincts by biologists. But if desire was limited to self-preservation, the evolution of higher forms would not be possible. Desire therefore includes not only the instinct to preserve the individual organism intact, but also to reproduce itself and further that element in life which enables it to progress, to expand and to transcend itself and for which the first two objects are necessary. It is this transcendent element in desire, which philosophers and scientists have ignored. Desire has hitherto been regarded by philosophers as only the instinct of self-preservation and reproduction of life, with which they are familiar, and thus, the main occupation of philosophic moralists and religious philosophers has been to speculate how to get rid of desire and thus destroy the very root of this low and painful existence. Aristotle truly said that "to seek the deepest explanation of natural phenomena is in the tendency of everything in nature towards the realization of the best and most perfect state of which it is capable." But even he, the great master, did not see that in life there was a further law, the law of

progress by which higher and higher forms of life are evolved. The living being not only realizes the best in it but transcends itself and produces a form of life higher than its own.

The propensity to better itself, to preserve and better the species and to strive for the evolution of a higher species must be considered as inherent in life. Desire not only means desire of things, which satisfy the recurrent appetites necessary for self-preservation and reproduction, but also of things which give satisfaction to the other craving inherent in life for a state of things better than its actual condition. A living protoplasm can scarcely be said to have any desire, though the feeling of dissatisfaction with its present condition is latent in it. The animal instincts are slowly developed. The actions in obedience to those instincts and the satisfaction arising out of them can be traced to desire as commonly understood. The desires for food and sexual enjoyment in their rudimentary forms are scarcely distinguishable from the properties of molecules, though they may be in reality very different to them. From these instincts is slowly developed what is called by some the æsthetic sense, in consequence of the dissatisfaction with its present condition, which is inherent in every form of life. The taste craves for more refined and keener satisfaction than the satisfaction afforded to the appetite of the primitive hungry animal man by raw meat or uncooked grain. Out of sexual desire is developed the sense of beauty and the pursuit of the beautiful in the animal. There is clearly no connection

between sexual desire and love of beauty. But the latter originally accompanied it and even now among civilized men still accompanies it. Beauty of colour, the dance and the song in animal life are accompaniments of sexual desire. They are the allurements of Mara,* which lead to the continuance of this life of pain according to the Buddhists. They are surely based on the instinct of reproduction of life. The law of life, which leads to reproduction, is not like the law which produces water by the combination of oxygen and hydrogen, to which there can be no variation, but it is a law which is in its reality a law for the evolution of the higher species through reproduction. The tempter, who, allures with sweetness and colour, and dance and music, is certainly not the evil one, as all religious men, Buddhists, Hindus and Christians, assert.

Mistake of
the ancients.

The impelling law in nature, which produces the higher form of life, requires the free strenuous effort of the individuals of the existing forms of life for its fruition. The materialist would say that the impelling law induces the effort as its cause and the manifestation of the latter is an effect of the former. We thus come with the materialist and the determinist to the "dull rattling off of a chain that was forged innumerable ages ago" and there is no voluntary action and decision in the individual. But life, as distinguished from dead matter, has undoubtedly the qualities of volition and decision. Desire is accompanied with free strenuous effort.

Free strenuous
efforts
accompanies
desire.

*The Buddhistic Tempter, who is identified with Kama or the god of desire of the Hindus.

Feeling for
the value of
things.

By the very law of our being, we desire things better than what we possess and are always judging what is that better and deciding what we should do to obtain it. This quality of life has given scope to the speculations of philosophers about the innate consciousness of value in the mind, first enunciated by Kant. Lotze in his *Mikrocosmos* rightly says that "truth is a mere reflection in the consciousness of an already existing world and is a barren rehearsal and has no significance and the scientific understanding has to be supplemented by the reason appreciative of value" and thus there are "the world of forms as the sole object of knowledge and the world of values as resting on merely subjective knowledge." The idea, says Pattison, is "as old as Plato, who subordinated truth to the general conception of the good and who said that "the world of forms must receive its final explanation from the world of values whose medium it is." It is truly said that "in its feeling for the value of things and their relations, our reason possesses as genuine a revelation, as in the principles of logical investigation, it has an indispensable instrument of experience." We thus come to judgments of value, which have become of late years the bed-rock of modern moralists and theologians, like Ritschl, and of theistic philosophers like, Lotze and Pattison.

What really
counts is
higher life.

Modern philosophers are right when they say that the living being has the power to discriminate what is better and is always doing so. Bradley says: "We make mistakes but still we use the essen-

tial value of the world as our own criterion of value and reality. Higher, truer, more beautiful, better and more real, these on the whole count in the universe as they count for us, and existence must correspond with our ideas."* How one would desire that he could demonstrate the truth of the above statement. The materialist says 'what really count for us are the keener gratification of our senses and self-preservation and propagation of the species. Beyond that we do not understand what the philosopher says of the higher, and the better; we are interested only in the enjoyment of the pleasures, which our present material body can feel, and in the avoidance of physical pains, of which the sentimental pains are only a variation.' The philosopher on the other hand conceives of the good as something final and absolute, which is the essential nature of the universe and which affords the criterion of its value. Both these positions are untenable.

Is the valuable an end in itself, in the appreciation of which our understanding is disinterested as Kant and Lotze and other philosophers maintain? We know consciousness is not possible without interest. Without interest, there is no attention and without attention the eye will not see and the mind will not think. A disinterested understanding is an impossibility. The Vedana and Trishna of Buddha are indispensable elements in every act of life. They are component elements of life. Buddha had no idea of the law of evolution

of higher life and therefore he considered these evil and did not see that it is on these that the evolution of higher life depends. But his logic destroyed forever the old doctrine of disinterested understanding and absolute good.

We are interested in the satisfaction of our senses, which leads to the self-preservation and the continuance of the existing species. Buddha and all materialistic philosophers forget that we are also deeply interested in attaining to a condition better than our present state, with which we are dissatisfied, by the law of our life, and we are always striving after the better. Our reason is always unconsciously feeling for the value of things necessary for the progress of life and with its imperfect vision is slowly groping its way forward in the dark. The living being in its painful sojourn, in its strivings and sorrows and pleasures, sees a ray of light in front and becomes conscious of something, which by the very constitution of its life it recognizes as better and by an imperative law of its existence it sticks to it and makes it a part of its life. But the absolute good it does not recognize. It can only recognize that which is a little better. The light that guides it and the vision it possesses enable it to perceive the next step forward in its path and not what lies beyond the milky regions. We have by the law of life to go step by step forward. "One step is enough for me" has been very rightly said by the poet. The philosophers are not satisfied with the one step and with the little better but they must have the final, the absolute good. They say

that the idea of the better is only relative to the idea of the absolute good. But in as much as we do not and cannot know what is the final and the absolute good, the speculation is futile and has in the past led to erroneous dogmas. Indeed, we have no idea of the good which will be evolved in the distant future and which our consciousness in our gradual progress will apprehend, far less can we have any idea of the final absolute good. Again the idea of the final absolute good is not also altogether noble. Our present idea of the good in our wildest flight of imagination must be evil in comparison with the idea of the good that will be evolved in the distant future.

It should be remembered that there is a fundamental difference between the idea of a line extended and such ideas connected with matter and the development of ethical, æsthetic and other ideas connected solely with life. A line extended to infinity is the extension of the same thing. In the world of ethical, æsthetic and spiritual ideas, the better that is evolved is not only not the same but is often the very contrary of what preceded it. Here the act of creating the better is continuously and unceasingly going on.

The idea of progressive good is not only truer but infinitely grander than the idea of the final absolute good. This alone is compatible with the true idea of a living God. A God, who created millions of years ago and is now resting and quiescent, who is without attribute and without action, is worse than dead nature. If the present material universe and the world of life were his final acts, he cannot

Idea of progressive good truer and grander than the idea of the absolute good.

even be called a perfect workman, as the scientist truly says. But if this universe of matter and force, life and spirit, reason and goodness is growing and becoming better and greater every moment, our reason at once recognizes that it would always be truer and grander than any final and perfect universe, which we may conceive.

God is always
creating the
newer and
better.

God is always creating the better. As evidence of that we find living beings are also always creating. The evolution of the better, the evolution of the higher life, is not a mechanical physical process of combination; it is an act of the creation of the new. It is so new sometimes that the latter form is wholly distinct, indeed even contrary, to the form, from which it was evolved. In morality we find it exemplified. The act of creation is going on. In the world of matter we find new substances are being formed by combination. In the world of life new forms are being evolved. It may be argued that new substances and new forms are no better than the old substances in combination. That is not quite true. However that may be, in life we find not only new forms but higher forms are being evolved. Unlike material substances produced by combination, higher forms of life can never be formed by combination of material substances, whether they are inanimate or are of the description supposed to be animate. New ideas also are being created. Philosophers say ideas are eternal or timeless. That may or may not be true, but they are nevertheless the creations of the human mind. A beautiful picture or, take

a simple case, a beautiful perfect circle is a creation of the human mind. A circle may timelessly exist in theory but has it any existence in reality, except when the human mind conceives it? The savage man had little idea of the symmetry and properties of a circle. The idea has been developed in the mind of man with the progress of the powers of his mind. A beautiful picture may also be called eternal but it is in reality a creation of the human mind. Our power of reasoning and our power of æsthetic perception are always creating new things. Similarly, that element in life which is evolving mercy, altruism and goodness is always creating newer, better and grander goodness.

The living being however, is always creating a newer, better, grander and more beautiful universe than is existing, not of its own force but in co-operation with another Power, who is the creator in a higher sense than it. A living plant produces a bud, which no chemical combination of matter or material force can produce, and the bud expands into a flower of exquisite colour and form. Without the co-operation however, of the rays of the sun, which is at a practically inconceivable distance from it, it cannot do so solely of its own power. Material changes in life thus require the help of outside material forces, which by themselves also are powerless to produce the result. In moral, intellectual, æsthetic and spiritual matters, this law of independent effort and outside help, as being indispensable for change and progress, is still more manifest. The living being cannot itself create. Its

efforts are necessary but all its efforts, without the help of an extraneous ineffable Power, would be unavailing. The Lord of life is always creating in loving co-partnership with His children, a newer universe every moment. There is thus nothing which has everlasting, unchangeable, absolute value.

As constituted at present, all men feel greater interest in the pleasures of the senses than in any thing else. Even philosophers and scientists, with very few exceptions, notwithstanding all their grand ideas, have not been any bit better in their lives than ordinary men, and many of them were probably a little more addicted to sensual pleasures. This is but natural in our present stage. The evolution of higher forms of life will induce interest in the pleasures of the more developed senses. But over and above all this, is the principle in life of which dissatisfaction with the existing state and striving after a better are constituent parts. To this principle we owe the little interest, which we feel in goodness, beauty and truth, apart from pleasures arising from mere sensual gratification. Here the Creator manifests himself in the lives of his children and helps them in creating newer, better, truer and more spiritual entities every moment. His purpose is beyond our reason and imagination. We only feel our inmost being vibrating to the touch of the loving hand of the all-merciful and almighty Lord of life and change into better and more spiritual forms. Stranger than any dream, which the Vedantist or the modern philosopher may in his greatest

exaltation have, is the fact that we the common ones feel that we are co-workers with the great God in creating a newer, better and more glorious universe every moment.

Let us now go to the speculations of the philosophers about God and self.

Religion and God are unfortunately regarded by most philosophers as objects outside the sphere of reason and occupy a secondary place in their speculations. Hume and Balfour considered matters religious "altogether outside the sphere of reason" and based belief on a "kind of inward inclination or impulse" or "strong propensity." Kant postulated "a rational God in the interests of science." Balfour attempted to postulate a moral God in the interests of morality. Philosophers and scientists, moralists and politicians thus lose sight of the real personal God. The tendency of the philosophers is "to let religion evaporate in intellectual terms," as William James aptly describes it. One philosopher writes, "perhaps the best thing we can say of God is that he is the *inevitable inference*". Vacherot writes: "religion answers to a transient state or condition not to a permanent determination of human nature, being merely an expression of that stage of the human mind which is dominated by the imagination", and considers that it will finally disappear in scientific philosophy. Professor Ribot writes: "Of religious sentiment properly so called, nothing survives at last save a vague respect for the unknowable,

which is the last relic of the tear and a certain attraction towards the ideal, which is a relic of the love that characterized the earlier periods of religious growth. To state this more simply, religion tends into religious philosophy."* Religion has been considered by ancient and modern philosophers and scientists as an indulgence in the exercise of the intellect about ideal and unknowable causes. Indeed man, in the fascination exercised on his mind by pure thought, has a tendency to ignore the real and the person. Thinking on the problems of the matter and of the mind leads one to the absorption in dead things. Religion has been therefore to them no better than a game of chess or pondering over a geometrical problem. But they have all known to their cost that life is not a game of chess but is a poignant and very real fact about a person, whose palpitating heart is not satisfied with abstractions and is in reality dominated by personal interests.

The philosophers have set up ideas in the place of God. A few, men less original and learned than they, followed them at a distance and gave material form to their word-pictures, as best as they could, and set them up as symbols or images of God for worship. The Samans, the exorcisers and miracle-workers also set up set forms of words and ritual as possessing the power of compelling the supernatural powers. The miracle-workers and the philosophers of their caste co-operated and set up images and set forms of words and ritual for worship. The kings, whose priests and

* Varieties of Religious experience by James p. 502.

guides these philosophers and miracle-workers were adopted the cults and forced them upon the common people. Many Greek and Roman philosophers and statesmen, including Cicero, considered religion and even a false religion indispensable as a social machine for the benefit of the masses. That has been the attitude of many philosophers and statesmen of modern times also. Machiavelli thought religion was necessary for government and Napoleon would invent a God for the same purpose. A learned Christian divine, Rev. Conyers Middleton supported Christianity for its utility and held that even if it were an imposture it would be wrong to destroy it. Early in the nineteenth century unbelief was common among philosophers and the ruling classes, but the view was firmly held that religion was necessary for the uneducated populace and that any attempt to disseminate unbelief among the lower classes must be suppressed. Religion was regarded as a valuable instrument to keep the poor in order.* Thus the common people for whose benefit the proud ones of the earth supposed religions were necessary, worshipped the symbols and images set up for them, adopted the forms and rituals and believed in the dogmas about them established by the philosophers, priests and their rulers and soon forgot that they were worshipping the creations of those placed above them, that their gods were mere symbols of philosophic phrases, ideas and dreams, and after a time took the priests at their word that the images exist-

* See Professor's Bury's History of Freedom of Thought p. 59.

ted from eternity and that their dogmas were all divinely revealed.

Worship of
Nothingness.

Thus images and symbols have been worshipped. Even images of Nothingness or Sunya have been made and worshipped in India, China and Japan. But mankind, though thus greatly influenced by them, have never been deceived by the philosophers. They have been seeking a personal God and the philosophers have failed to convince them that He is the unknowable X or is a mere philosophical word-picture or is the substance or the totality of the universe or a mere image and has no real existence, personal and vital, in relation to an individual living being. Even the god of Nothingness became a very real and personal god to millions of common men, who obeyed the philosophic priests in worshipping him.

Similarly, Christians, when they philosophized, defined God as the Word. The New Testament says that the "Word was God and" in the beginning there was Word," forgetful of the fact that without the living being the word and its meaning could not come into existence. The famous word Om is regarded as a symbol of and also as God himself by the Hindus. Mystic words have been regarded as invested with supernatural powers. As a matter of fact the worship of Nothingness and words invented by philosophers have been productive of great tangible results which will be described in full in the Chapter on Mysticism.

Philosophers'
ideas of God

William James rightly says of the philosophers: 'What is their deduction of metaphysical attributes

of God) but a shuffling and matching of pedantic dictionary adjectives, aloof from morals, aloof from human needs, something that might be worked out from the mere word God? They have the trail of the serpent over them. One feels that in the theologians there are only a set of titles obtained by a mechanical manipulation of synonyms; verbality has stepped into the place of visions, professionalism into that of life.

* * What keeps religion going is something else than abstract definitions and systems of concatenated adjectives". William James however, relied on visions rather than on words. But the history of mysticism shows that the visions of mystics are shaped in the images as found in the descriptions and word-pictures in the authoritative and popular religious books and are not of greater value than they.* Notwithstanding this worship of fancies, visions, words and dogmas, which originated in mystics, philosophers and theologians, religion has still been the most vital motive power in the life of humble men, who have had no skill in the manipulation of words or whose nervous systems have not been weak enough to see visions and who, though they may have framed their religious ideas on the word-pictures of philosophers and visions of mystics, have believed in a divine Helper and Friend in their life of toil and trouble.

In a subsequent chapter, I have traced the origin and history of the idea of God. God is not a creation of philosophers. Indeed a personal *i.e.*, a real God has never been popular with philosophers. We

*See the Chapter on Mysticism.

have also seen that though mankind always worshipped a personal God, its ideas have been greatly influenced by the philosophers. The common man has never attempted to define God. The philosophers have done so for his benefit. I will take the definition of the Upanishadas as the one beyond which philosophers have not yet been able to advance the idea of God. They thus describe Him: He is the real and all else is phenomenal. He is pure reason or wisdom. He is the infinite. He is joy. He is the eternal. He is the absolutely quiet one. He is the good. He is the pure one. He is the beautiful one. He is love, is added by the dualistic Vaishnavas.

The philosophers in their anxiety to find an absolute infinite God have always defined Him in negative terms. The Upanishadas describe Him as "Not this. Not this." He is naught that our reason or imagination can apprehend. Modern philosophers also have defined Him in like terms. Let us consider them for a moment. He is the real and absolute and all else is phenomenal. That means He is something beyond our apprehension. He is without attributes. He is infinite. We simply put a not before finite and describe him. Every negative definition is like that.

Let us take the positive definitions of God. He is "the life of life." the "mind of the mind," "the eye of the eye." "the ear of the ear," "the Brahman, greater than the greatest, less than the least." He is the good. He is love. What are all these but mere words. What is life? It is what vivifies *i. e.*, it is what makes life. What is life of life? *i. e.*, what gives life to life?

Mind of mind is no better. Greater than the greatest and the like are mere words. What is goodness? What is love? What is meant by a person being goodness or love? All these positive ideas, when analysed, will be found to be really negative definitions. Diderot wrote of the idea of God as "an idea which explains nothing, consoles no one, makes every one anxious and whose utter nullity is proclaimed by the fact that it consists of pure negatives." This is true only of the philosophers, ideas of God literally understood. But all these negative and positive definitions, though mere word-creations, convey a very real meaning to the consciousness of common men, but it is a meaning which the words by themselves cannot have. William James rightly observes; "philosophy lives in words but truth and fact well up into our lives in ways that exceed verbal formulation."

Let us now consider some of the speculations about God and self. The scientists in general admit the existence of an inscrutable and unknowable power or force beyond nature and her forces. Philosophers are divided to three classes: (1) those that consider nature, man and God as in reality identical with or manifestations of, one absolute reality, (2) those that consider matter, individual soul and God three different real entities, (3) those that consider that every thing has to be considered as one organic whole and that nature, man and god cannot exist independently, they being complementary of one another. The first idea, with its multiform phases fancied by philosophers, makes the

Philosophic
speculations
about God
and self.

entire universe a dreary meaningless entity. God or the Brahman becomes, as a famous Indian allegory describes it, like a spider weaving a net out of the exudation of its own body, which not only entangles other insects but also entangles itself to death. The philosopher cannot conceive of the idea of creation. He can not go beyond matter. The recently established facts of disruption of atoms and radio-activity and the like however, have shattered the old orthodox ideas. The fact of formation of matter from something less complex than matter has exploded the old idea of the impossibility of creation.* The production of new forms of life and the creation of new ideas are facts of experience. The creator exists and the act of creation is going on in endless time, as we have seen before. The very essence of the spirit is the act of creation. The ideas of pantheism, vedantism and panpsychism and the like are only phases of pure materialism in the garb of a false spiritualism. The third idea is merely a variation of the first and a futile attempt to avoid its absurdities in a maze of words. It too is based on the model of a purely material universe and ignores the creative immaterial spirit as an impossible conception. Diderot bases his atheism on the supposition that it is a mistake of the human mind which imagines the physical qualities as distinct and thus gets the idea of the soul as distinct from the body and from that the idea of God as distinct from the world. The position of the materialists will be considered in detail in the chapter on Biology and Religion.

*See Professor Moore's *The Origin and Nature of Life* p 31.

Pantheism, as we have seen above, is like pure materialism and is little better than atheism. The counterpart to it called individualism also, Erdmann rightly says, leads in its realistic form to atheism and that the systems of such professed theists as Leibnitz, Wolf, Baumgarten, Meier and Berkeley are fraught with difficulties and contradictions, because logically they lead to atheism.* A new class of philosophers, while repudiating that the ideal only is the real and also that the material universe alone is real, have come to the conclusion that one is complementary of the other and neither of them can exist separately. Pattison says: "It is sufficient for the purposes of Idealism that nature as a whole should be recognized as complementary to mind and possessing therefore no absolute existence of its own, apart from its spiritual completion, just as mind in turn would be intellectually and ethically void without a world to furnish it with the materials of knowledge."* As a corollary of this doctrine, it is asserted that the individual self cannot exist without God and that God cannot exist without man, both being complementary of each other. It is the old pantheistic idea, which the philosophers can not shake off, in a new garb of apparent reconciliation. It is true that the consciousness of the Ego necessarily implies the consciousness of the non-Ego. But that does not mean that they have no separate existence. It is no good speculating on the matter. Our consciousness and reason are perfectly certain that they have

Separate existence of God and self.

*See the analysis of the matter in Erdmann's History of Philosophy p. 265.

separate existence. It is true that light and colour sound and music have no existence apart from the mind but we are perfectly certain that the modes of motion, which produce those impressions on the mind, exist apart from the mind of the perceiver of those impressions. Similarly, the perceiver or the Ego has apprehension only of the sense-impressions of modes of motion and thus may be imagined not to have any existence apart from them. If however the latter have separate existence, as they undoubtedly have, the mind and the ego necessarily have separate existence. It is the coming together of these two distinct real entities that produce the phenomenal world. The modes of motion exist, the mind and the perceiver exist in reality and also the colours and sounds and the like; so do beauty and harmony, goodness and mercy; we cannot deny the reality and the distinctness of their existence.

It is impossible to deny the real and separate existence of matter, modes of motion, sense-organs and the perceiving ego. The work of the scientist and the philosopher is not to attempt to prove a fancied identity of the three and to put a stop to all human endeavour in life, as well as in the realms of physical science and of mental science, but to discover the laws governing each of them and to find out the real relationship between them. Similarly, it is impossible to deny the existence of the individual perceiving, thinking, moralizing, pitying, loving Ego and of God. It is necessary to conceive a separate perceiving Ego in order to give reality to the glories

Separate existence of the Universe, the Ego and God.

of nature and to give meaning to dead nature and her forces. It is also necessary to conceive of God in order to give meaning to life and to the individual self. A universe teeming with innumerable protoplasms, without the power of evolving higher forms of life, would be absolutely meaningless. A universe covered with vegetation alone would be equally meaningless. A world occupied by lions and tigers or cattle browsing with "the green grazing happiness of the herd," spoken of by Nietzsche, may give a terrible meaning to cruel nature, reeking with blood, unredeemed by any trace of goodness and mercy. When we come to man in his primitive condition, things are no better. Man, even the most intellectual philosopher and philanthropist, is but dead matter compared with the intelligence and goodness which may be found in an angel. It is the potentiality of progress that alone can give any sufficient meaning to existence. As I have mentioned before, that potentiality, without an outside Entity exciting it and working along with it would be ineffectual. Further, the higher forms give an additional meaning to the lower forms. The primitive all but dead vegetable forms would not have sufficient meaning without the higher plants and trees. The beasts would give an additional meaning to vegetable life. Vegetable and beast life would not have sufficient meaning without man. What is man? He is little better than the beast and indeed little better than mere dead matter. To give sufficient meaning to the life of man a higher order of beings is necessary. The purpose of life rightly said "is to

be better." The correctness of the doctrine of Descartes that the consciousness of self as an imperfect finite being involves an idea of some thing perfect and infinite or God has been denied by many philosophers, but surely if the better does not exist or cannot exist, life is purposeless and meaningless. There is not only a scale of existence reaching from dead matter to pure spirit, but newer and higher forms are being created every moment by the Good One. The Creator of the better is necessary for the existence of the individual and the progress of life. He alone can give purpose and meaning to individual life. Without Him, all is purposeless, meaningless. neither comedy nor tragedy but the dread void.

Believers in God can have no consolation from philosophic speculations, which deceive only those that indulge in them. Indeed men, who can find no better reasons for believing in God, accept them, and these speculations only help the philosophers and their followers in clutching at old faiths, which they cannot forsake but for which they have no sufficient reason. All the mediæval philosophers, Locke and Leibnitz, Kant and Hegel, indeed the greatest among the philosophers of Christian Europe, have found their philosophy establishing the doctrines of the trinity, the eternal punishment in hell-fire of sinners and the atonement. The greatest among Hindu philosophers have found their philosophy establishing the worship not only of the tri-une God but of millions of other gods of various forms. These speculations have no real practical influence on life, for people

and even the philosophers themselves, aye even the materialistic scientists, in their heart of hearts go on believing in god or gods of their forefathers, notwithstanding their opinions that they themselves are the the supreme God himself or parts of a universal dead nature.

The speculations of philosophers about God, though mostly futile, as Diderot characterized them, were however accepted by religious teachers and priests, to whom learning was till recent times practically confined, because they affected to be of the class of philosophers and because these speculations favoured the mystery about things religious. These speculations accepted by the learned became naturally very popular even among the common people but they have had little influence on the religious beliefs of men. William James rightly says that even theism " whenever it has erected itself into a systematic philosophy of the universe, has shown a reluctance to let God be any thing less than the All-in-All, in other words has always shown a tendency to become pantheistic and monistic and to consider the world as one unit of absolute fact ; and this has been at variance with popular or practical theism, which latter has ever been more or less frankly pluralistic, not to say polytheistic, and shown itself perfectly well satisfied with a universe composed of many original principles, provided we be only allowed to believe that the divine principle remains supreme and that the others are subordinate."* That is true not

*Varieties of Religious Experience p. 121.

only of Hindu India but also of Christian Europe. In India, the pantheism of Sankara has got complete possession of the minds of the learned and is very popular. Even ignorant peasants would talk glibly of Maya or illusion and of the identity of every thing with God. But in actual practice in Northern India, the people worship Rama and Sita, and the intensely devotional book, Tulsidase's Ramayana, is every day read, worshipped and regarded as holy, as is the Bible by the Christians. The book is full of the most fantastic and puerile creations of the fancy of the poet. But it is animated with the glowing love of God, which dominated the life of the saintly writer. The heart of the common man built up a very real and true religion out of the imaginary stuff in the book. There is a beautiful story in the famous life of Chaitanya, the Chaitanya-Charitamrita, a book in Bengalee, which is worshipped by millions. It is recorded that while Chaitanya was travelling in southern India, he found in a famous temple one evening the Bhagbat Gita being read by a great pundit. In the admiring crowd of men, he saw a poor man sitting quietly in a corner, hearing intently the words that fell from the lips of the philosopher and tears were streaming from his eyes. In wondering respect for the man, Chaitanya went to him and reverentially asked him questions on the Gita. To his surprise he was told that the man did not understand a word of Sanskrit and had no idea of the pantheistic doctrines and of the merit of desirelessness inculcated in that popular book. "Why were you in tears?" asked Chaitanya. The man

answered: " I saw before me the great God Krishna sitting on the car of Arjuna and out of his great love speaking to the latter. The love in my heart welled forth and tears involuntarily flowed from my eyes." Chaitanya, it is said, threw himself at the feet of this ignorant unsophisticated devotee and considered himself blessed by contact with him. I mention this well authenticated story as illustrating the fact that philosophic ideas and words may be of little value in the sense in which they were used by the learned but they may evoke a very real living religion in the heart of man.

In Europe also, the people worship God and Christ, the Mother of God, the angels and the saints, and read the Bible, with its many stories, and the philosophical speculations in which they may indulge in the public are like the gown and the legal language of a lawyer, which he casts aside as soon he reaches home. These speculations do not touch the real self of palpitating living beings. But they too have their use. They have purified religion of its dross and superstitions and led it to higher regions, though as a rule they are atheistic in their tendencies. They must not therefore be ignored by positive religion, though they must be combated so far as they tend to the denial of the personal God.

Some philosophers, as we have seen before assert that the world of matter requires as a necessary complement, the world of ideas. They would be wrong if they meant that these two have no distinct separate existence. The truth is that these two are

known to exist and thus really exist, because the phenomenal world, in which they are fused by an inscrutable process, exists. Only in that sense are they complementary of one another. Similarly, when the philosophers say that man and God are complementary of one another, they would be wrong if they meant that they have no distinct separate existence. The truth is that the God as cognized by us, *our* God, which is supposed to be complementary of us, is anthropomorphic. The Christian philosophers described God as God-man. All the gods of Greece and Rome and India, whose images showed their origin, all the human incarnations of God, Hindu and Christian, all god-inspired prophets and Samans, all the Mahatmas of the theosophists, have been clearly made in the image of man, but there is not the slightest justification for the theory that man was made in the image of God.

he anthropomorphic and the true God.

The pantheistic philosopher comes to the conclusion that he himself is God or that the totality of all things or of all *his* concepts is God. The naturalistic and deistic philosopher, who is no less proud than the pantheist, cannot conceive God as better than himself or nature, as limited by fixed laws. The humbler theistic philosopher conceives God as the embodiment in an infinite measure of all that is desirable and good in man. The infinite includes the finite. Finite and infinite are surely complementary of each other. God as conceived by us may be complementary of man but the true God transcends

both. He transcends the finite and all human ideas of the infinite, of man and the God conceived by man. As the living being progresses in the scale of life, like his ideas of beauty and ethics, his idea of God is every day being transmuted to more glorious forms and we have no conception of the final outcome of the process. This does not mean that God is created by man's imagination and intellect and his ethical and æsthetic powers. He exists in truth and reality. By a wonderful law, the powers of life are being so evolved that they are continually tending towards transcendent types. The true God takes up the living being by the hand from its original condition of all but dead matter and leads it to pure and purer spiritual forms. He wants the living being to be probably like Himself. He is at the heart, at the base of the life of man and thus man is always trying to conceive him according to his own lights and is always failing. Philosophers say God is the 'life of life,' 'spirit of spirit,' 'the individual in whom other individuals are mere accident.' All these are mere words giving expression to the attempt of the human mind at approximation of the idea of the true God. God is however not the God of the speculating philosophic man but He is the true God of life, of whose existence the living being in its heart of hearts is conscious and whose influence is evolving higher life, higher and still higher spirituality and freer and still freer individuality.

We have next to consider the position of the great philosophers that God is unknowable. We

Whether God
is unknowable

have already considered the opinions of modern pantheistic philosophers. Hegel has written a violent diatribe against Vedantism, which says that all is God. Krause, Spinoza, Schelling, Wagner and Hegel have made a distinction and said philosophy is absolutism; it is ~~the~~ the theory not that all is God but all is in God. But Hegel says that religion is knowledge had by the Divine Spirit of itself through the mediation of the finite Spirit and its ultimate object is self-union with God. The Vedanta says the same thing, only it is less mysterious in its language than Hegel. Fichte says that the converting of God into the world and of the world into God are both atheism. They would certainly be anthropomorphism. If God is the glorified self or a being with whom the glorified self can coalesce, as a drop of water does with the ocean, to quote a popular Hindu simile, there can certainly be a definition of the nature of God. But in that case, Jacobi's observation that all definitions of the nature of the Divine Being are anthropomorphisms would be strictly correct. Kant and Fichte's subjective science of self, in which the individual rational being is the highest, would equally lead to anthropomorphism. Indeed, all the modern philosophies, when analysed, would be found to lead to anthropomorphism or to the conclusion that God is unknowable.

The position of Kant and his school is, as Jacobi who agrees with it says, that knowledge is limited to the sphere of the relative finite pheno-

mena and therefore the existence of God cannot be demonstrated and His nature cannot be known, for a demonstrated God is no God. Modern philosophers have therefore been inclined to fall back on faith and revelation. This is destroying the foundation of all true religion and making it the object of ridicule of positive science. All modern theistic philosophy, alike with Hume, and Rousseau and Herbert Spencer, celebrates the unknown and unknowable God. But is the position that God is unknowable strictly correct? Knowledge is certainly limited to the sphere of the finite. But that sphere is becoming wider and wider and the scope of knowledge is becoming greater and greater with the greater range of the senses and of reason, that are being developed with the progress of the living being. The consideration of the ideas of the finite and the infinite will illustrate our position.

A point, a straight line and a line extended to infinity are not strictly known in the ordinary sense in as much as they are mere abstractions; what we can know *i.e.*, handle, is the space or length between the points. But the abstractions of a point and of an infinite line are quite real and thus we have some knowledge of them. Again, mathematics does deal with infinite lines and infinite series and the like and reduces them to objects of positive knowledge as understood by metaphysicians. A straight line extended to infinity becomes a circle, decimal recurring to infinity is $\frac{1}{3}$. The sum of an infinite series in a geometrical progression is a finite number. These and other similar

results are demonstrated by mathematics. Of course some mathematicians assert that these are mere approximations and not absolute. What mathematics does is to divide finite objects into its infinite components and to reduce infinite sums to finite numbers. The dividing line of the finite and the infinite does not exist. Our apprehension of all things is an approximation, which becomes greater and nearer to truth and reality with the growth of our powers of thought. But the things must be objects of thought, in order that this doctrine of approximations, first enunciated by Newton in mathematics, may be applicable in order that the knowledge of reality may be nearer the truth with the growth of the powers of thought. The analogy of the theorems of mathematics is not conclusive but it shows that an infinity of finite objects of thought is also an object of thought. So the metaphysical speculations about relative and finite phenomena and the absolute limits of knowledge are not founded on fact and cannot prove that the existence of God and His nature are absolutely undemonstrable and unknowable.

The word infinite is wholly unintelligible to a savage man and the idea conveyed by it to a schoolboy is very different to the idea conveyed by it to the mind of a modern astronomer like Laplace. Similarly, the idea conveyed by the word finite to the mind of a microscopist like Pasteur is very different to the idea which a schoolboy derives from the word. The infinite, as well as the finite, is unknowable in the sense in which God is declared to be unknowable.

by the philosophers. But the fact is undoubted that with the development of the powers of life, the ideas about the infinite and finite and the like grow and become clearer and fuller.

Descartes and Spinoza were of opinion that infinity is a positive and finitude a negative conception and from the idea of infinity proved positively the existence of God. Locke on the contrary held that finitude is the positive conception and infinity is merely its negative. The idea of the finite is in reality quite as subtle as the idea of the infinite. Every idea connotes its contrary. Finite and infinite, real and unreal, matter and spirit, being and non-being, the finite, imperfect progressive, individual living being and God go together. One cannot be conceived without the other. If the finite is real, the infinite is real. Being and non-being are quite as real as becoming. The ancient Hindu philosophers however said with truth that all concepts are not real and gave such examples as conceptions of the sky-flowers. So ideas and words may represent what is real or may be only imaginary. The finite is approved by the senses and the idea is thus real; and the infinite is connoted by the finite and thus is also real. The material is approved by the senses and the spiritual is necessarily connoted by the material and thus both are real. Ideas like finitude and materiality are certainly grounded on sense-perceptions but they are in reality as impalpable as lines and points, and the ideas of infinity and immateriality are not more imaginary than ideas of infinitely produced straight

Consciousness
transcends all
ideas of the
finite and the
material.

lines and of points or of infinite algebraical series. James rightly said; "The subtlety of nature flies beyond the ideas," which owe their origin to sense-perceptions and "the formulas are but approximations." By a mysterious law of our being, the sense-perceptions lead to the ideas of the material and the finite and there "well up into our lives in ways that exceed verbal formulation" the consciousness of the infinite, of the spiritual and of God. The fact is however not wholly the result of that mysterious law.

The ideas of length, breadth and width conveyed to the mind by the senses are capable of extension. Our vision is limited by the power of our eye-sight. The horizon and the heavens above us are the half globe, of which the radius is the length to which our eye-sight is limited. But we find that if we go forward, the horizon recedes. We can not comprehend the infinite but we find that a line may be one foot or a million feet and may be extended beyond any limit however great. The fact that the mind is conscious that a line can be extended without limit is what is meant by the statement that it can apprehend the infinite. Similarly we find that our sense-impressions about material objects and ideas connected with them become less and less gross and material. These impressions and ideas are inseparable from material objects but they become more and more independent of matter, as life grows. The mind, as its powers develop, is conscious of the fact of ideas becoming less and less material beyond any fixed limit. That is

meant by the statement that it apprehends the spiritual. This is a positive fact of experience. Our ideas may be relative and mere approximations, as the mathematician says, but nevertheless the philosophers truly assert, the mind transcends all these positive ideas conveyed by the sense, perceptions and arrives at a positive idea of the infinite the essence of which is the determination of reason and the consciousness of fact that space and time, however extended, may still further be extended. Our mind likewise transcends all material limits and arrives at the positive idea of the infinite and of the spirit, which is always growing and becoming higher and more spiritual.

Philosophers often ignore this great truth and go on in the 'hollow industry' of imagining ideas and coining words to express them and of declaring them to be absolute truths and the only reality. Philosophy has its uses and is not of no value, as scientists assert. But its value consists in testing the ideas and words found or made by it and in ascertaining which are real and which are imaginary. But the test lies with the experience of living beings. What is approved by the experience of living beings and what normal consciousness cannot deny may be considered real. Our experience approves of a real and positive God. Our inmost being is conscious of Him, as it is conscious of lines and points, of beauty and goodness.

I have shown in the chapter on God and Self that our present ideas of God are imperfect

The idea of God grows with the growth of the powers of life, a fact which shows that God is as real as life.

and may be even false. But like every other element in life our idea of God is becoming, with the growth of life, truer, better and higher. Indeed, the idea of God in the mind of the civilized intelligent religious man is so different from and indeed contradictory to, the idea of the fetish of the primitive man that it is difficult to conceive that the former has been evolved out of the latter. The evolution of the idea of God stands on the same footing as the evolution of higher life and accompanies it. The fact further proves the reality of God and that the idea of God is an inherent element of life.

The scope of our consciousness and reason is continually expanding. I shall show in a subsequent chapter how the idea of God is growing and expanding in our consciousness. Our reason and the spiritual element in our being transcend all material environments and fleeting phenomena and take us to the Lord of life and reason and goodness. Our knowledge of Him is growing better and clearer every day. The idea of God of a modern learned man is not the idea of God of the primitive man. A newer, truer and more glorious idea of God is being evolved by the living being every day with the progress of life's powers. The fact, says the atheist, shows that God is a creation of the fancy of man. On the contrary the fact that higher ideas of God are evolved with the evolution of higher reason and greater powers of life shows conclusively the reality of the existence of God. It will be shown hereafter that the existence of God

is indispensable for ~~the~~ progress of life and the development of higher powers of life. To say however that we can demonstrate the existence of God or His nature is unjustified but to say that we know nothing about Him or His nature is also, it must be said, equally unjustified. What is true is not that God is known or is unknowable, but that He is becoming increasingly more knowable and better known with the growth of the powers of life.

Our present ideas of goodness, beauty and the like will give place in time to truer, higher and nobler ideas of them. The ideas of goodness held by men in past ages are now found to have been evil, and a similar fate may overtake most of our ideas in future with the evolution of higher life. Nevertheless, the very essence of nobleness and duty is our loyal adhesion to such goodness as our reason approves and our consciousness apprehends. There is no other goodness for us. Our present ideas of God likewise, will surely give place to truer, higher and more glorious ideas of the Sun of life. The God whom our ancestors worshipped was no better than a tree or a stone, or an imaginary blood-thirsty ghost or malignant lustful spirit. Our present idea of God also will surely be found to be very ignoble in time. Nevertheless, the God our reason now approves and our consciousness apprehends is the only God for us, Whom we should worship and Who, in what form soever we may worship Him according to our idea of the best and the highest, accepts our worship out of His infinite

love. Truer and more real than goodness, beauty and the like, which we now apprehend, the true God exists. Our inmost being vibrates to His touch. His helping hand is found in every step of the onward progress of life. Our conceptions of Him are surely evil and grotesque, because of the defective powers of our senses and of our reason, because of our ill-developed powers of life. But over and above and beyond all our conceptions and all our images and verbal formulations of Him, transcending all our ideas, the true God manifests Himself in our lives.

Noble religions and great philosophies have served a great purpose for the progress of man. But the dogmas and the ideas of God inculcated in them have been found to be wanting by positive science and are inconsistent with moral and social ideas of the present day and as a consequence, men are losing their faith in God altogether, because the exponents of the prevailing religions and their philosophic supporters assert that there is no god other than their god as described in their ancient revealed books. It is possible that there can be a religion and an idea of God, which are not inconsistent with positive science and modern ideas of morality and freedom and for which we have not to say that we have no authority except special revelation to one or two favoured men and have no reasons, except miracles and mysterious reasons incompatible with natural laws, and no warrant, except what is afforded by our ignoble inclinations and imaginings, which we glorify

Criticism of religions and philosophy necessary but the examination of the biological facts still more important.

by denominating faith? These pages are merely an attempt to establish the possibility of such a religion. Religions and philosophies have been criticized in such attempt. Their errors however are easily pointed out. But the reasons given by biologists and materialists are difficult to meet, as they are based on facts of science about life. We must therefore consider whether such facts disprove God and the spiritual element in man.

CHAPTER IV.

SCIENCE AND RELIGION.

The living body has been analysed by scientists. They have found that most of the actions of the living body are results of chemical and physical laws. Even consciousness and reason, some assert, are nothing more than material. Most biologists find no room for God or any spiritual element in life. It is useless to indulge in philosophic speculations or to speak of religion and God, if the materialistic theories of life are admitted to be true. To shut our eyes to facts of science and to the inferences arising from them and to go on believing in religion and God, even though they are inconsistent with what we are convinced are scientific truth is not compatible with the reality of our religion and our belief in God. The consideration of the facts of biology and the positions of the materialists can not be avoided in any investigation about the truth and reality of God and religion. Hitherto every religious man had a philosophy for his religion. Most people adopt the ideas of the philosophers of their time, and always talk about their religion in philosophic terms, just as in India people commonly assert that all is God. But now people talk about biological and other scientific facts in preference to philosophic speculations. Every educated man has now to entertain some ideas about these facts of science and some, though they are convinced that these lead to atheism, take refuge

in the mysteriousness of God who is regarded as not being an object of reason, while others manipulate them to suit their pre-conceived ideas. But nobody can any longer ignore these facts and the inferences arising from them.

What are the characteristics of life (1), what is the origin of life (2), whether it is wholly material, or partly material and partly spiritual or whether the spiritual is evolved out of its original material condition (3), whether consciousness, volition and reason are results of material combinations and force or energy, (4), whether God is necessary for the existence and progress of life (5): these are the questions with which we are pressed and which we must answer, before we can have any religion.

The main characteristics of life have been described in a recent biology primer, which I cite because of its succinctness and freedom from any attempt at temporising with those who are not materialists, as "(1) the capacity for feeding itself, (2) the capacity for responding to stimuli to impulses from within or from without; (3) the capacity for multiplying itself."

In another recent book the characteristics of life are described as "(1) Growth; the passive power of incorporating in itself under suitable conditions animate or inanimate matter and of imparting to that matter its own distinctive qualities. (2) Hunger; an active desire in the nature of attraction to come into contact with suitable matter. (3) A power of internal

*Primer of Biology by Professor Gregson.

adjustment to changing conditions. (4)Memory".* The power of internal adjustment to changing conditions comes within the general rule of adaptation to environment. Another biologist lays down that life "must pass through the phases of growth, maturity, reproduction, decay and death". This is identical with the Buddhistic doctrine.

Professors Geddes and Thomson thus describe the characteristics of life: "We recognize four chief characteristics—growth, cyclical development, effective response and unified behaviour. The living creature grows after a fashion all its own, not as a rolling snowball, by mere accretion, but by a unifying incorporation; not even as a crystal grows, at the expense of dissolved material chemically the same as itself, but at the expense of material different from itself. Again, it has a cyclical development, from egg-shell to seedling, from seedling to bean-stalk; from egg-shell to tadpole, from tad-pole to frog; it shows an orderly, correlated, regulated succession of events, which leads from apparent simplicity to obvious complexity; but as Huxley puts it, "no sooner has the edifice, reared with such exact elaboration, attained completeness, than it begins to crumble". Inanimate objects have a certain power of response to external stimuli, as a piece of potassium shows when thrown on a basin of water, but the responses of a living creature in normal surroundings are effective, self-preservative, usually making for betterment. Lastly, the living creature has a persistent unified behaviour,

* Humanity and its problems by Alfred Hook.

a power of profiting by experience, a creative capacity as a genuine agent."*

Now all the above writers profess to define life in terms of materiality and their works are attempts to trace every phenomenon of life to matter. They find it difficult to explain the phenomena by the properties of matter and get out of the difficulty by ascribing the effects which are clearly not material to what is called the *law of complexity*,† which is no better than inventing a word to explain the inexplicable, well known to dialecticians. Another eminent biologist describes the main characteristic of life to be purposive behaviour. Here also in an attempt to whittle away the effect of non-material purposiveness by using the word behaviour which materialists consider is sufficient to reduce life's chief characteristic to terms of matter.

As regards the power of assimilating extraneous matter in its own constitution or body it cannot be said to be a peculiar characteristic of life. An atom by the law of gravitation can attract another and hold it fast and by other physical laws two atoms may coalesce. As regards responsiveness to stimuli, it has been proved by the experiments of Sir J. C. Bose that stone, iron and the like substances known as matter respond to stimuli. Sir J.C. Bose has attempted to prove the truth of the popular Hindu pantheism by saying that all matter is living and the universe is the Brahman. But what his

* Evolution p. 76.

† Moore's Origin and Nature of life p. 188.

experiments and his inferences, if correct, would prove is that responsiveness to stimuli is not a characteristic peculiar to life. What the scientists ignore are the power of determination and purposiveness the addition of which to all the characteristics described above would constitute life. Take them one by one. It is not assimilation or attraction of other matter to itself that is peculiar to life. It is the power of discrimination, the power of taking in only such matter as is required for the preservation and growth of the constitution of the body of the living being and of rejecting what is not required for it that distinguishes life from non-life. Take the second. Responsiveness to stimuli, which those scientists say is identical with sensitivity which includes sensibility, is supposed to be the chief characteristic of life. It has been proved that responsiveness to stimulus is found in some material combinations of organic matter and will be probably found to exist in inorganic atoms also, and it is thus not a peculiar characteristic of life. The truth will be apparent when you go to higher types of living organisms which have developed organs of sense. It will be found that an act of determination or will, which is known as attention, is necessary to make a sense-impression effective in regard to a living being. The image of an external object may fall on the retina of the eye but the living being cannot see it until it directs its attention to it. Scientists fall into grave errors by ignoring the established principles of psychology, and philoso-

phers likewise, indulge in vain fanciful speculations by ignoring biology and the other exact sciences.

Having regard to the above, the characteristics of life which biology would approve would seem to be: (1) the power of assimilating food for the preservation and growth of the body together with the power of determining what food would suit the purpose; (2) capacity to respond to stimuli, external and internal, brought about by material causes which are made effective by attention, volition and what is called purposiveness; (3) the capacity of evolving the known sense organs and, when they are evolved, of apprehending and discriminating the sense-impressions, some of which, if not all, correspond to pure immaterial ideas; (4) the active power of reproduction which is not the same thing as mere liability to reproduction, as is supposed to exist in the case of those organisms which if divided into parts by external agency form separate organisms, but the power or the willing act of reproduction; (5) the dominant inclination and power to preserve the individual organism intact for a period; (6) the inclination accompanied with a certain amount of power to preserve the species, which is strangely enough more powerful than the instinct of self-preservation; (7) the inclination accompanied with a certain amount of effective capacity to better the individual and the species and to evolve a higher form of life, which dominates all other impulses, as will be shown hereafter (8) the power to evolve finer senses and greater powers of life; (9) the power to evolve reason, art, goodness and mercy; (10)

True characteristics of life in the light of biology.

amenability to a law of progress by which higher types of life are evolved, and which leads to life being more and more characterized by non-material entities like reason, art, mercy and the like in an increasing and higher measure and by increasing power over matter and by decreasing subjection to material influences. The last three are included in (7) and are mentioned separately for greater clearness.

Power over
matter a characteristic
of life.

It will be observed that power over matter and to make use of matter is a characteristic of life, which becomes more and more manifest as higher types are evolved. It accompanies life from its very inception. "The capacity for feeding itself" involves the power of making use of matter and converting it into forms necessary for the nutrition of its body. The capacity for responding to stimuli includes, says the biologist, the capacity of the living organism "of responding in such a way as to protect itself from such as are hurtful and also the capacity to take every advantage of such as are favourable to its well-being".* This connotes power over outside matter. Its existence is admitted by scientists. Lord Kelvin thus speaks of it, while describing animal and vegetable life: "Its power of directing the motions of living particles in the demonstrated daily miracle is infinitely beyond the range of any scientific enquiry hitherto made."

Formation of
structure.

Further, a very wonderful and mysterious circumstance distinguishes life from non-life in reference to the characteristic described above. A dead

*Gregson's *Primer of Biology*.

material substance like a dead leaf is sensitive to light and heat. Heat may expand a substance and cold contract it. There the thing acted upon must produce a certain result and has no option in the matter. A living being can so adapt itself as to make such outside influence serve its own purpose and it brings about structural changes in its body adapted to make such influences beneficial. The biologist says "specific organs are developed for the express purpose of receiving special impulses, eyes for receiving light impulses, ears to receive sound impulses, special tactile organs in the skin for the reception of contact-impulses, taste organs in the mouth and adjacent cavity for the appreciation of food and so on. Moreover, we find a special system of conducting strands, nerves, having for their duty the transmission of impulses to a central organ, the brain, from which again another set of nerves transmit impulses generated there to mobile organs, muscles, acting on a jointed skeleton, and thus giving the entire organism the power of locomotion or permitting of movements in individual parts of the body." The biologist in this statement of facts, in its multitude of words, conveys to the bewildered mind of the ordinary man, the impression that all is matter, impulse and force. But how are the special organs developed? Are the changes produced on the constituents of the body by the influence of light and the like by some chemical or physical law? No such law is known. Further, it is apparent that the living organism has its part in this development. It has the power of responding to stimuli by adapting its

body for the reception of the impulses, for protecting itself from hurtful influences and also that it may take every advantage of such stimuli as are beneficial to its well-being. The living being thus has the power to make use of matter. It also apparently creates by an act of its will. Light acting upon the body produces the eye. But the eye is produced, because the living organism by a determined act of its own disposes its body so as to receive the stimulus produced by light in such a way, that as a consequence of it, the eye is produced. The scientific name of this power is the power of the organism of adapting itself to outside influence. Pattison rightly says: "Terms like stimulus, response, behaviour, all imply the notion of selection, the power of adaptation to environmental changes, by which the organism maintains and develops its own characteristic being". The scientists ignore the fact that the living organism adapts, which means that the phenomenon is an act determined by it, a fact made clear by the errors it often makes in making its selection of its course of action. That desire to receive the sense-impressions is the essential element in the evolution of the sense-organs is demonstrated by the fact that in parasites these organs disappear when the desire to make use of them ceases altogether*.

Structure and
function how
related in
evolution
higher life.

This leads us to a modern biological principle, which is true and is of far-reaching consequence and which we shall have to consider more fully later on. "Structure and function react

* See Evolution by Geddes and Thomson p. 110.

upon each other as evolution proceeds", says the biologist.* We have seen before how structures come into existence. The development of higher powers in living beings is accompanied with finer and more complex structure. The biologist truly says that self-consciousness and reason would be wanting if certain brain-cells are deficient. The apprehension of certain colours, sounds and even of ideas depends on the existence of certain fine parts of the body. The structure of the brain becomes more complex as powers of thinking become higher. The mind requires fine machinery to enable it to carry on fine and complicated thinking. Sense-organs and finer brain-cells have thus been evolved. The materialist argues from this that all the functions of the living being are effects of matter. The reasoning would have been faultless, if structure did not come into existence out of the purposiveness of the living being. The desire to be better and the effort to be so bring about structural changes. Mere chemical or physical action can not produce the result. We shall consider this matter further when the question whether consciousness and reason are material is discussed. It is enough here to mention that one of the chief characteristics of life is to bring into existence sense-organs and thought-organs and other structure, finer and finer, as it evolves higher forms. They come into existence because of its desire and effort—they are results of its power over matter, its "creative capacity," in the words of Professor Thomson.

*Moore's Origin and Nature of Life p. 16.

Attention and
ideas necessary
for the use of
the sense-or-
gans.

We have seen before that the images thrown on the retina would not be perceived at all, unless the living being wills it by directing its attention to it. But that is not all. The vision perceived corresponds to certain ideas of form, which though they cannot be conceived apart from matter are in their essence no part or attribute of matter as such. The living organism alone perceives the various colours and beauty of form. Light and colour cannot exist without the eye and the living being. Materialists would say that the electro-magnetic wave disturbances called light acting upon the molecules of the living body produce the eye. These waves acting on all molecules would not produce eyes. Life or the active will or inclination of the living being is the essential element in the process of the formation of the sense-organ. The modern philosophers attempting to reconcile science with philosophy describe the result as the effect of Nature's attempt at self-revelation. Lotze says: "The beauty of colours and tones, warmth and fragrance are what Nature in itself strives to produce but can not do so by itself; for this it requires as its last and noblest instrument, the sentient mind". But light acting on the body is certainly not an attempt of nature to produce the colours. It is the living being which uses the forces of nature, "which partly lay compulsion on us and partly allow themselves to be moulded to our ends". But are colour and sound, beauty and harmony, reason and goodness merely "the fleeting fancies of the individual", as Balfour puts it, or merely

results of combinations of dead molecules and are the electro-magnetic waves and the like the only "immutable verities" of nature? Science is not so unscientific as to deny reality to eyes and ears, and colour and sound, dependent on the reality of the conscious individual. The conscious individual living being is real and he brings into existence, for its preservation and enjoyment and betterment, not only the eye, but also light and colour and perceives outside phenomena by reducing the sense-impressions into ideas.

As the intestine reduces the food to a condition which enables the living being to assimilate it and to give it the quality which protects the body from being destroyed by outside chemical influences, similarly the objects of the sense-organs, *i. e.*, the entire material universe, with its variegated qualities and attributes, are the food of the spiritual element of the living organism. They pass through the sense-organs and are reduced to ideas, which the living being assimilates for its self-preservation and progress. Like blood and muscle and nerve produced by the food digested by the intestines, are ideas of space and time and form and colour, wonder and joy and the like entities produced from the outside physical phenomena like light, which are the food of the spirit made fit for its assimilation by the sense-organs and the brain. Reason may likewise be attempted to be traced to the action of physical phenomena upon the sense-organs. But we know of no sense-organ capable of producing it. Reason, goodness mercy, altruism and

the like cannot be traced to the action of any sense-organ.

The inter-connection between the ideas of form, the organ of sight and light, and their dependence on each other for their very existence, and above all, their dependence on the attention of a living being consequent on will induced by its desire to enjoy the outward material universe, are marvels in life which cannot be ignored. This inter-dependence of physical phenomena, sense-organs, sensation, attention, perception and idealization in life must be investigated. How apparently immaterial ideas again become finer and more spiritual should be pondered over. It is sure we shall know more of life and spirit with the investigation of the above problems.

This intermixture of spirit and matter or the evolution of the spirit from matter and the power of the spirit over matter and the various manifestations of the spirit in the course of its evolution through the progress of life, are the great mysteries that the wondering mind of man has been striving to solve, since it arrived at that stage of progress which brought philosophy and science into existence.

It is necessary to consider in greater detail the positions of the materialists. Their strongest point is that life must have originated from pure matter. Scientists are divided into two classes in regard to this question.

Origin of life. There are some, like Lord Kelvin, who cannot believe that life could be evolved out of pure matter and explain the beginning of life on this globe by assert-

ing that with the burning mass of matter thrown out by the sun, which when cooled became the earth, living protoplasms were sent out to it, for "life alone can produce life". The idea practically connotes the eternal character of living protoplasms and the eternal character of pure matter and is only the old atomic Sankhya theory of an infinite number of souls and an infinite number of atoms, in the garb of scientific language. On this theory there can be no death but only change, a speculation leading to the theory of transmigration. If the living entities were liable to final death and reduction to matter, as the materialists assert, it would be possible to conceive of circumstances under which they might disappear from the universe altogether, leaving pure matter in undisputed possession of it. Again the idea of living germs being thrown out from the sun involves the idea of something material, however minute, which could be thrown out with pure matter. Thus the idea is merely a paraphrase of the idea that life is only a description of matter. It is not impossible that living protoplasms came to this earth from the sun. But how did they come to the sun? From a bigger sun, would be the answer. But suns were originally formed out of pure atoms of matter floating in space. So the living protoplasm must have accompanied atoms of pure dead matter and thus logically, there can be no analysis of material things however minute which may not be accompanied with life, and matter and life become indistinguishable.

Haeckel attempted to solve the riddle of the universe by imagining that each atom posses-

sed "a rudimentary form of sensation and will, or as it is better expressed, of feeling (æsthesis) and inclination (tropesis)". *This was however too much for Mr. Clifford who asserted that every molecule did not possess mind or consciousness, but possessed a small piece of mind stuff which on combination with other molecules formed sentience.† This is the old hylozoism of Strato, according to which primitive particles are endowed with life and which Cudworth amplified by attributing to every component part of the physical world a plastic nature, the essence of which is thought, provided that by it is understood nothing conscious.

But all these forms of matter and the so-called protoplasms of the biologists, whether they are feeling and willing and thinking or not, are liable to death or to reduction to pure matter in whatever minute forms they may be conceived and the scientist can find no trace of any immaterial substance. Sir Oliver Lodge whose opinion on life and death is quoted hereafter, says that on death there is no diminution of weight and no change in the constitution of the atoms constituting the body and thus there must be an immaterial ghost who only leaves the body at death. This is an idea as old as the primitive man, who however was more scientific in as much as he bound the ghost to some part of the body or to some other material substance, as he could not conceive of a purely immaterial ghost. The philosophers came into exis-

* The Riddle of the Universe Ch. XII.

† Lectures and Essays Vol. II p 85.

tence after thousands of years of culture. They speculated on the duality of an infinite number of immaterial souls and an infinite number of material atoms and also on the unity of the universe consisting solely of matter or solely of one spiritual substance. These ancient speculations led to no advance in knowledge and were absolutely barren and gave no comfort to the living beings, whose inevitable lot was pain and death. Modern scientific theories about living beings and dead atoms and the like, mentioned above, are the old speculations in a new garb.

There are scientists who believe in spontaneous generation of life from pure matter. Pasteur has proved that to be mythical. But nevertheless, modern biologists, though they may not agree with Haeckel that every atom of matter has sensation and will, find it difficult to believe that life is sent either from the sun or from heaven to this earth of ours. They find it more consonant to scientific ideas that life was evolved out of the elements composing the earth when it came into existence as a burning mass of matter thrown out by the sun. The great botanist Nageli held a position which it must be admitted is consistent with inductive logic and the accepted canons of scientific inference. He said truly: "If in the physical world all things stand in casual connection with one another, if all phenomena proceed along natural paths, then organisms, which build themselves up from and finally disintegrate into substances of which inorganic nature consists, must have originated primi-

Spontaneous
generation of
life from mat-
ter.

tively from inorganic compounds. To deny spontaneous generation is to proclaim a miracle".

Speculations
about matter
producing life.

Another modern theory is that certain forms of matter in its elementary form, cyanogen radical or colloids and the like first came into existence as chemical and physical results of combinations and disruptions of atoms and these led to proteid molecules which are essential parts of the physical basis of life, and then protoplasms came into existence. There is a great deal of truth in this theory. It is the same fundamental question of structure and function mentioned before. Without the machine to be worked by it, the living being is powerless and therefore cannot exist. The living being must have a habitation. The machine also cannot work without the living being. The two are indispensable to one another. How they come together is a mystery which will probably never be solved. The attempt to solve it will take us to more and more elementary forms of matter and life and nearer to the root of all things.

If life is wholly material, the living organism can be no better than an excellent machine. Professors Geddes and Thomson say on this: "The physicists tell us that the living creature resembles some wonderful kind of engine; it is a material system adapted to transform matter and energy; and it illustrates in its living a number of well-known physical phenomena, of surface-tension, of diffusion, of elasticity, of hydrostatics, of

thermodynamics, of electricity, and so on. At the same time it has to be admitted that not even the simplest vital activity, such as the passage of digested food from the alimentary canal into the blood-vessels, can be completely described in terms of physical formulæ. The fact is that when we add up the components revealed by chemical analysis, they do not amount to the whole resultant which we see in a vital action, even of a simple sort.

"It is indeed profitable to compare a living creature to a machine, and a fertile method of discovery to press this comparison to its hardest. Yet the living organism differs from any machine in its greater efficiency ; and especially in this, that the transfer of energy into it is attended with effects conducive to further transfer and retardative of dissipation. Again in this, that it is a self-stoking, self-repairing, self-preservative, self-adjusting, self-increasing, self-reproducing engine? And this also must be remembered in comparing a living creature and a machine, that the latter is no ordinary sample of the inorganic world. It is an elaborated tool, an extended hand, and has inside of it a human thought. It is because of these qualities that highly complex machines come to be so like organisms. But no machine profits by experience, nor trades with time, as organisms do. Therefore it is that the formulæ that serve to describe the activity of a machine will not suffice for living creatures which demand an historical explanation".*

* Evolution p. 76.

Having thus disposed of the machine theory the learned authors propound another theory in these words: "It is probable that the potency of living matter is in part an expression of the complex inter-relatedness of the diverse proteids and other substances of which it is compared. No single substance may mean much but in combination they are irresistible. Indeed, we many compare protoplasm to a successful firm which owes its success to an unusually fortunate combination of partners of inventing organizing, administrative and other geniuses! But there is something more. The firm works as a unity and this is its essential secret".*

Then they discuss the theory that life is a result of chemical combinations: "The chemists tell us that the physical basis of life always includes proteids and similar highly complex substances, and that the process of living involves an intricate series of combustions and fermentations and reconstructions, many of which can be imitated outside the body altogether and expressed in chemical formulæ. On the other hand we can not give a chemical description of any complete vital function, or of any activity of the living creature as a whole and unless, as the Germans say, we throw away the baby with the bath, we cannot ignore the most salient fact, that all the manifold chemical processes are correlated and controlled in a united behaviour, in a purposive agency. Even the amoeba is no fool"†.

*Evolution p. 73. † Ibid p. 74.

Biologists trace back life to living cells which, they say, may have been evolved out of organic matter, which again may have been evolved out of inorganic matter. Professor Moore thus gives a succinct and correct account of the analysis of the constitution of the body. "The body of one of the higher animals or man consists of an enormous assemblage, or community, of many millions of living units far outnumbering the total population of human individuals on the earth, and this vast community of living cells, which together constitute a living man or woman, are, in a state of health, so co-ordinated and regulated as to excel, in goodness of government and co-adaptation to one another's wants, any social system which has ever regulated a body corporate in human history. There is just as much division of labour and mutual assistance and governance as in a state or vast empire, and moreover, there are scarcely any of the defects of a bad government in the affairs of men in a social community, which may not find their paralled in the organic happenings in a single human body when invaded by disease. Similar types of cell are aggregated together into formations, called tissues, designed for serving some common office of the body, and at times two or three tissues are blended together to form what is termed an organ for carrying out some special task"* Haeckel says that innumerable living cells acting intelligently in unison. like a republic, constitute the organism of man †

*Origin and Nature of Life. p. 198.

†The Wonders of Life,

This commonwealth of primordial, all but unconscious, unreasoning cells is supposed to produce unified action and to produce minds like those of Newton and Darwin and empires, religions, philosophy, science, morality and self-sacrifice. The theory is indistinguishable from the machine theory. Scientists in their anxiety to trace every phenomenon to matter and physical laws, go into as great absurdities as do philosophers like Berkeley, who by very powerful reasoning abolished matter.

To what fantastic and grotesque lengths scientific men may go in their eagerness to abolish the spirit and God, the ideas of which it is fashionable to consider as unscientific, is exemplified in some of the theories of modern learned men. Some of them have supposed that the orderliness of the universe has been evolved as a result of the action and reaction of atoms regarded as psychical individuals in their struggle for the best *modus vivendi*. * One author supposes physical laws as results of evolution: 'In the beginning infinitely remote there was a chaos of unpersonalized feeling, which being without connection or regularity would properly be without existence. This feeling sporting here and there in pure arbitrariness would have started the germ of a generalising tendency. Its other sportings would be evanescent but this would have a growing virtue. Thus the tendency to habit would be started; and from this with the other principles of evolution, all the regularities of the universe would be evolved. At any

*See Ward's Realm of Ends or Pluralism and Theism

time however an element of chance survives and will remain until the world becomes an absolutely perfect, rational and symmetrical system in which it is at last crystallized in the infinitely distant future"* The growth and progress of the universe is explained by coining two words. "*Natura Naturata* or what is done, the decision made, the habits formed, the customs fixed which constitute at any stage, the routine the general trend of things, within which future possibilities lie and what is still to do," and *Natura Naturans* "which implies further spontaneity and growth, new decisions to be taken, fresh experiments to be made with their usual sequel of trial and error and possible eventual success" † Matter making new decisions, fresh experiments, finding out the errors patiently, waiting for eventual success and adopting what succeeds! Haeckel's atoms possessing æsthesis and tropesis and Clifford's molecules possessing small pieces of mind-stuff are also supposed to do the same thing. The absurdity is patent and the scientist, like the philosopher, has to go to the realms of pure fancy and to declare that "matter is effete mind" and "inveterate habits become physical laws" ‡ Thus the scientists have to become Berkeleyan idealists or Vedantists of ancient India or to fall back on the atomic theory of the old-world philosophers of India and Greece, who frankly denied God altogether. The sportings of atom producing orderliness must be less rational than the sportings of the God of the Vaishnavas of India.

*The Architectonic of Theories in the Monist January 1891. See. Wards Gifford Lectures.

† C. J. Pierce quoted in Pattison's Ideas of God p. 184.

‡ Ibid.

The theories of the numberless living cells which undoubtedly constitute the body, acting together as one mind, is fantastic and fanciful and can not be accepted. Still, how can science recognize an immaterial soul inhabiting the body and controlling the numerous living cells constituting it, as something apart from those cells and from the entire body? The theories of the materialists may be untenable but we can not shut our eyes to the difficulties of establishing a separate soul.

Ideas of soul.

Unified behaviour and purposive action are, it is admitted by biologists, to be the chief characteristic of life. Can it be explained in terms of physics and chemistry, is the question. Words like vital force, æsthesis, troposis, mind-stuff and nature do not explain anything. Men generally ascribe the result to the soul and the mind. But what are they? The popular idea of the soul or the spirit, from the primitive Saman to the twentieth-century spiritualist and theosophist, is that it is a subtle kind of matter, like air or breath, which permeates the body but is capable of existing apart from it and which might appear after death or even in life in a dim vapour-like duplicate of the body. Aristotle considered it as the sum of vital functions, which is the same thing as the modern vital force, which explains nothing. Descartes, one is surprised to find, endorsed the opinions of Christian and Muhammadan philosophers and regarded all animals as mere material machines and distinguished man alone by the possession of a soul which exercised the functions of thought and volition, ignoring the very patent fact that on that theory the

vital force becomes a material force, and if the actions of a monkey could be explained on the machine theory, the actions of a man could also be explained by that. Plato alone among philosophers regarded the soul as being of a nature radically different from that of material things and incapable of being perceived by the senses and which could only be apprehended by the intellect and which existed before and after its union with the body. All the ideas of soul or vital force prevalent popularly among ordinary men and among philosophic professors of all the great religions are thus materialistic and we need not consider them separately from the theories of the materialistic biologists who attempt to give scientific and rational explanation of them. Are they right or are those, who consider that the living being is dominated by a non-material entity, right?

The materialistic biologists fight shy of the machine-theory but all their theories are, it is clear, based on it. They identify mind with the structure of the nervous system and consider consciousness as an agglomeration of sensations, each sensation being attached to some functional element of the nervous system or brain, all these elements again being connected together as an immensely complex machine, all the actions being explained by the Law of Complexity.

The questions whether there is an immaterial element in life and whether thought and consciousness are not results of material forces and physical laws cannot now be attempted to be solved by mere fanci-

ful speculations or by fantastic reasoning. They must be considered in the light of undoubted facts found by modern science.

During the last twenty years, biology has made wonderful discoveries which have made most of the positions of the philosophers, both materialistic and idealistic untenable. It was established late in the last century that the sense-perceptions were possible only when there were healthy cells in the grey cortex of the brain, which are the inner sense-centres or *sensoreæ*. It was discovered in 1894 by Flechsig that not only "there are four central sense-regions (*"internal sense-spheres"* or *æstheta*) in the grey cortex of the brain" but also "four thought-centres (*"association-centres"* or *phroneta*) between these". The conclusions of Flechsig have been subsequently modified by other distinguished biologists as regards the delimitation of the regions in the brain. The most approved conclusion on the matter is thus described by Haeckel "For the general conception of psychic action and especially of the cognitive functions, it is not necessary to have the delimitation of the regions. The chief point holds that we can to-day anatomically distinguish between the two most important organs of mental life; that the *neurona*, which compose both, differ histologically (or in finer structure) and ontogenetically (or in origin); and that even chemical differences (or a different relation to certain colouring matters) may be perceived. We may conclude from this that the *neurona* or psychic cells, which compose both organs, also differ in their finer structure and

here is probably a difference in the copliced febrils which extend in the cytoplasm of both organs, although our coarse means of investigation have not yet succeeded in detecting this difference. In order to distinguish properly between the two sets of neurona, I propose to call the sensory cells or sense-centres æsthetal cells and the thought-cells or thought-centres phronetal cells. The former are anatomically and physiologically the intermediaries between the external sense-organs and the internal thought-organs. To this anatomic delimitation of the internal sense-centres and thought-organs in the cortex corresponds their physiological differentiation. The sensorium or sense-centre works up the external sense-impressions that are conveyed by the peripheral sense-organs and the specific energy of their sensory nerves; the æstheta or the central sense-instruments that make up the sensorium and their organic units, aesthetal cells, prepare the sense-impressions for thought and judgment in the proper sense. The work of "pure reason" is accomplished by the phronema of the thought-centres, the phroneta (or the various thought-organs that compose it) and their histological elements, the phronetal cells, bringing about an association or combination of the prepared impressions. By this important distinction we avoid the error of the older sensualism (of Hume and Condillac &c.) namely, that all knowledge depends on sense-actions alone. It is true that the senses are the original source of all knowledge; but in order to have real knowledge and thought, the specific task of reason, the impressions received from the external world by the sense-organs

and their nerves and centres must be combined in the association-centres and elaborated in the conscious thought-centres."

Haeckel then thus describes modern philosophy: "The great regard which the critical philosophy of Immanuel Kant obtained during the nineteenth century have been increased in the various schools of philosophy. As is known, Kant affirmed that only a part of our knowledge is empirical, or *a posteriori*, that is, derived from experience; and that the rest of our knowledge (as for instance mathematical axioms) is *a priori*, that is to say, reached by the deduction of pure reason, independently of experience. This error led to the further statement that the foundations of science are metaphysical and that, though man can attain a certain knowledge of phenomena by the innate forms of space and time, he cannot grasp "the thing in itself" that lies behind them. The purely speculative metaphysics, which was built up on Kant's apriorism and which found its extreme representative in Hegel, came at length to reject the empirical method altogether and insisted that all knowledge is obtained by pure reason independently of experience. Kant's chief errors, which proved so injurious to the whole of subsequent philosophy, lay in the absence of any physiological and phylogenetic base to his theory of knowledge; this was only provided sixty years after his death by Darwin's reform of the science of evolution and by the discoveries of cerebral physiologists. He regarded the human mind with its innate quality of reason as a completely formed entity from the first and made no enquiry into its historical de-

velopment. Hence he defended its immortality as a practical postulate, incapable of proof; he had no suspicion of the evolution of man's soul from that of the nearest related mammals. The curious predisposition to *a priori* knowledge is really the effect of the inheritance of certain structures of the brain, which have been formed in man's vertebrate ancestors, slowly and gradually, by adaptation to an association of experiences and therefore of *a posteriori* knowledge. Even the absolutely certain truths of mathematics and physics, which Kant described as synthetic judgments *a priori*, were originally attained by the phyletic development of the judgment and may be reduced to constantly repeated experiences and *a priori* conclusions derived therefrom".

The conclusions arrived at by Haeskel are :
 (1) "The soul of man is objectively considered essentially similar to that of all other vertebrates; it is the physiological action or function of the brain. (2) Like the functions of all other organs those of the brain are effected by the cells which make up the organ. (3) These brain-cells, which are also known as soul-cells, gangliome-cells or neurona, are real nucleated cells of a very elaborate structure. (4) Within the cortex we have localized a number of different mental activities or traced them to certain regions; if the latter are destroyed, their functions are extinguished. These regions are so distributed in the cortex that one part of them is directly connected with the organs of sense and receives and elaborates the impressions from these; these are inner sense-centres or sensoria. (6) Between these central organs of sense lie the intellectual or

thought-organs, the instruments of presentation and thought, judgment and consciousness, intellect and reason, they are called the thought-centres or, association-centres, because the various impressions received from the sense-centres are associated, combined and united in harmonious thought by them".

(7) "Each special mental activity is determined by the normal constitution of the relevant part of the organ or section of the phronema. (8) Man's consciousness, like all his other mental powers, is a function of the brain and may be reduced to physical and chemical processes in the cells of the brain".

He next attacks those biologists, who accept the fact of the existence of the phronema and consider the brain as merely the instrument of the soul. He thus compares the two ways of thinking on this matter :

Monistic theory of knowledge.

Knowledge is a natural process not a miracle. Knowledge is a physiological process with the brain for its anatomic organ.

The part of the human brain in which knowledge is exclusively engendered is a definite and limited part of the cortex, the phronema.

Dualistic theory of knowledge.

Knowledge is a supernatural process, a miracle. Knowledge is not a physiological but a purely spiritual process.

The part of the human brain which seems to act as the organ of knowledge is really only the instrument that allows the spiritual process to appear.*

*Haeckel's Wonders of Life p. 10-13, 23, 24, 27.

He elaborates the points of difference and is satisfied that the dualistic or spiritual theory is unscientific and false. Reinke an equally eminent biologist in his recent works accepts all the facts discovered by the biologists and proves dualism, theism and teleology from them*. It should be observed here that in reality there is no difference, except in naming matter spirit, in materialistic monism and philosophic monisms, like pantheism and its numerous variations. The real contest thus is between monism, biological or philosophical and dualism, involving individual soul and personal God.

We cannot but admire the courage and love of scientific truth of Haeckel, when we find in him a perfect unconcern and no hesitating or halting in his disbelief in immortality. But even he, the pure scientist, has not been able to shake off the superstitions of his fathers, which he so vehemently decries. He rightly exposes the Semitic and Christian error of animals being considered soulless and says : "Descartes, a pupil of the Jesuits, only applied his theory to man and regarded animals as soulless automata. But the theory is quite absurd to modern physiologists, who know from innumerable observations and experiments that the brain or psychic organ in man behaves just as it does in the other mammals and especially the primates". He then says that even in the mammals, life and automatic instinctive action is possible, if the part of the brain, which is the seat

*See Reinke's *The world as Reality* (1899). and *Introduction to Theoretical Biology* (1901).

of thought and consciousness be removed. He concludes that all forms of life below the mammals, as they do not possess the phronema in the brain, have no power of thought and self-consciousness and are soulless. He further says that the newly born child does not possess the phronema and is soulless and there can be no harm in distroying deceased children. The extravagance of this scientific statement in itself refutes its truth. Bergson, whose philosophy is very much coloured by the opinions of biologists, also accepts this position.* The only difference between this position and the old Semitic position is that it draws the line at mammals, ignoring the fact that according to all the canons of scientific reasoning such a line is inadmissable. Even in invertebrate animals and vegetables, life can not be preserved without adaptation and selection *i. e.* without judgment and determination or will, and self-consciousness and unity of action. There may be and there probably is a material organ, which is the instrument of these functions of life. But that organ, if it exists, surely exists in all forms of life. It can not be detected by the microscope in the brain-matter of lower animals, that is all you can say. The subtle character of the organ would not make it non-existent or wholly immaterial. We have no experience of the spirit acting independently of matter, rightly says Haeckel, but that does not prove that spirit is matter. European scientists and philosophers only know of the ideas of soul and spirit, which are denied to the lower

*Creative Evolution.

animals by the theologians, and when they have demonstrated the absurdity of those ideas, they are satisfied that there is no soul and no spirit.

The undoubted fact of life is that it is difficult to discover the dividing line between dead matter and the lowest forms of life, between dead atoms and the plasms of the biologists. The atheistic biologists who condemn the theistic or dualistic hypothesis on the ground of want of uniformity are themselves obliged to make themselves liable to the same charge. They must explain the existence of reason, goodness, art and other entities, which they acknowledge to be inconsistent with dead matter, and therefore to avoid the inconvenient inevitable inference of spirituality, they have recourse to the unscientific hypothesis of dead matter and living matter, psychic atoms and the like. These hypotheses are clearly inadmissible upon their own showing. They admit that they can not find the dividing line between dead matter and living matter and still assert a dualism as pronounced as that of those who believe in the non-material spirit. Therefore we must fall back upon the consistent scientific theory of pure materialists that life is evolved out of what is called dead matter, that reason, ethics, art, mercy and the like are mere changes, chemical and physical, in the brain-matter. Those, that find it impossible to believe that reason and the like are mere chemical or physical changes, are therefore obliged to have recourse to the miracle of an entity being evolved out of another entity, inconsistent and contrary to

any form of matter in its character or to "purposiveness" in nature, or like Bergson, to "vital impulse" in "the ocean of life" or "the original impetus." To mention the possibility of an explanation by reference to spirit and God is considered unscientific and unphilosophical. Every extravagant theory, that may be imagined, is therefore possible but not spirit and God.

The atheistic biologist finds it impossible to believe in creation. But the evolution of reason out of dead unreasoning matter is nothing but the coming into existence of something new and foreign to it. The pure scientist looks at the lowest forms and concludes that the highest forms are the natural effects of the former. The method is right in respect of all physical phenomena. This is the strength of monism, materialistic and idealistic, theistic and atheistic monism being really indistinguishable from one another. The real question is whether the phenomena, which characterize the highest forms of life, can be reduced by analysis into the components of the lowest forms

The great biologist and experimental psychologist Wundt, after a careful consideration of all the recent discoveries, has come to the conclusion that "physical processes correspond to every psychic phenomenon, but the two are completely independent of each other and have no natural casual connection". On this Haeckel observes: "This wide-spread dualism finds its chief support in the difficulty of directly connecting the processes of sensation with those of movement; and

so the one is regarded as a psychic and the other as a physical form of energy. The conversion of the outer stimulus (waves of light, sound etc.) into an inner sensation, sight or hearing is regarded by monistic physiology as a conversion of force, a transformation of photic or accoustic energy into nerve-energy. The important theory of the specific energy of the sensory nerves, as formulated by Johannes Miller, forms a bridge between the two worlds. But the idea which these sensations evoke the central, process in the thought-organ or phronema, that brings the impressions into consciousness, is generally regarded as an incomprehensible mystery. However, I have endeavoured to prove, in the tenth chapter of the Riddle that consciousness itself is only a special form of nervous energy and Ostwald has lately developed the theory in his Natural Philosophy. The processes of movements, which we observe in every change of one form of energy into another, or every passage of potential into actual energy are subordinate to the general laws of mechanics. The dualistic metaphysic has rightly said that the mechanical philosophy does not discover the inner causes of these movements. It would seek these in psychic forces. On our monistic principles they are not immaterial forces but based on the general sensation of substance which we call psychoma and add to energy and matter as a third attribute of substance". *Huxley and other sturdy atheists regard the process by which ideas are produced in the mind as an incomprehensible and

Process by
which ideas
are produced.

insoluble mystery. Haeckel in his anxiety to establish atheism finding this insolubility to be an argument in favour of theism, goes to the length of agreeing with the dualistic metaphysician that beyond the physical phenomena of energy and matter, there are the entities, the Substance, the laws of Substance and psychoma is a third attribute, mark, not of matter but of substance. This is giving away completely the case of the materialistic atheist. This kind of special pleading is very common with clever advocates who are themselves unable to detect the palpable fallacy in their arguments. The position to which atheistic biologists are driven namely, that the human organism is a republic of innumerable living organisms with little thinking or psychic attributes, acting together like one person, is grotesque in the extreme and excites amusement to an observer of the ways of modern republican states, consisting of the most civilized and intelligent and cultured nations of the earth. The philosopher Bergson removes the difficulty by *Vital impulse*, which is however only explaining a difficulty by a phrase which leaves the main question where it was. That there is a dominant as asserted by Rienke, the opponent whom Haeckel endeavours to refute, is clear to every impartial thinker. But that fact does not establish the pure immateriality of reason and the like.

It is undoubted that the highest forms of life have been evolved from the lowest, all but unthinking, purposeless, unethical forms. The question is how have the all but immaterial reason, art, ethics and

mercy been evolved out of such conditions. The monist says that out of dead matter all these glorious entities have been evolved. Most materialistic atheists are satisfied that the process is incomprehensible and insoluble.

It is an established physical and chemical law of universal application that it is possible in the material world to reduce by analysis whatever may be formed by any kind of synthesis to its original components. It is also beyond doubt that the law does not apply to life. The phenomena, which characterize the highest forms of life, can not be reduced by analysis to the components of the lowest forms. Life has not yet been reduced by analysis to dead atoms or electrons. Ideas of forms of beauty, of laws of thought, of ethics and of mercy cannot be traced by analysis to properties of molecules or electrons. But it is true nevertheless, that these phenomena appear only in connection with matter. Even in dead matter, a molecule can be analysed into points and lines and surfaces and forms. But can an atom be formed by synthesis by the combination of form, surface, line and point? These immaterial ideas exist, though we apprehend them only in connection with material objects. It may be true that the spirit is evolved out of matter, and that we find it only in connection with matter, but it is certainly an entity outside matter. The glorious transmutation of dead, unthinking, unethical, merciless matter or energy gradually into more and more spiritual forms is pos-

'Distinction
between material
and living
forms.

Higher living
form can not
be reduced to
lower form by
analysis.

sible only through the influence of a Power or Force outside the living organism, whom scientists and philosophers call the Substance, the unknown cause, the original impetus the ocean of vitality and the like, but whom our poor helpless men recognize as the great Helper of life in its upward progress.

Dualism un-
avoidable.

It is impossible to avoid dualism. The monist says that there is only Substance, which is subject to universal physical laws. Matter, says Haeckel, is "extended substance, which occupies infinite space." It is true however, that there is space where there is no matter or substance. It is a fact of nature—of science, like a surface or a line. Dualism is therefore unavoidable.

There can be no realization of ideas of form without the sense-organs, but we are convinced that the ideas exist independently of them. The process of thinking is impossible no doubt without the normal delicate machinery in the cortex, which enables comparison, classification and the like. Mental arithmetic is possible, but the machinery of the brain is imperfect yet and cannot work the complicated problems of higher mathematics without writing material. Thus for higher complicated thought, writing material and the machinery in the brain are indispensable. But reason certainly exists independently of such instruments, without which it cannot now work. Without the Broca fissure in the region of the cortex speech is impossible. But the ideas, which speech above all other instruments of the spirit convey to us, exist nevertheless, independently

of it and other machinery, through which they may be conveyed. The atheistic scientists are never tired of asserting that the idea of the duality of matter and spirit is popular, because of "the deep-rooted mysticism, we have inherited from our barbaric ancestors which we find it hard to shake off". As a matter of fact, as I shall hereafter show our barbaric ancestors had absolutely no idea of the immaterial spirit, and even now the acutest philosopher and scientist in civilized Europe has but very little idea of the spirit. We are all immersed in material ideas. The writings of Haeckel and also of the philosophers show that the truth is that on account of the deep-rooted materialism of our nature, inherited from our barbaric and animal ancestors, we are unable to shake off the idea that all is matter and to get an idea of the spirit. The idea of the spirit is being slowly evolved in life, as we shall see hereafter.

In criticizing Kant's philosophy Haeckel says: "What seems to-day to be an innate capacity or an *a priori* quality of our phronema is really a phylogenetic result of a long series of brain adaptations formed by *a posteriori* sense-perceptions and experience." The biological truth contained in the statement cannot be denied but the conclusion deduced from it is not justified. It is true that in the rudimentary forms of life there was practically no reason and the cortex, which the biologist says is the seat of reason, was not detectable. Slowly with the evolution of the higher powers of life, just as in the case of the sense-organs, like the eye, the instruments, which enable reasoning, are evolved and become

finer and finer, as required for the exercise of the growing powers. The crucial question, whether the organs are first evolved, or the powers are first evolved, has clearly but one answer. We find them simultaneously existing but as the eye can not come into existence without life, it follows that the evolution of the instrument, such as the eye, is logically subsequent to and consequent on the evolution of the higher power of life for the exercise of which it is required. It is possible to have ideas of form without the eyes but their full realization is facilitated by the eyes. The powers of making distinction, comparison, generalization and inference may have their seats in the cortex. But there were no such powers manifested in the rudimentary forms of life and there was no cortex. The person or the republic of individuals, which according to Haeckel and other biologists constitute the higher living organism, as it developed these powers also developed these delicate machinery in the brain, which enabled it to exercise the powers. The subtler the power of reasoning, the more complex and subtle would be the machinery by which the mind would work. We find that the mind is capable of acting without extraneous help, such as writing material, only to a certain limit. It can work in mental arithmetic but the problems of higher mathematics can be solved only with writing material. That is because of the imperfection of the machinery in the brain. The cortex shall certainly be so developed in time, that these also may be worked mentally. But even then subtler problems will require writing ma-

terial or other extraneous help for the mind to solve them. The brain will in time develop still better machinery for the purpose and so the process of progress will go on. The development of the cortex will follow the progress in spirituality made by the living being.

There were no immaterial ideas in the beginning. The method employed was *a posteriori*. But with the progress of life the conceptions derived *a posteriori* from tangible material objects slowly became more and more fine, subtle and spiritual. The ideas of the point, the straight line, space and time were not possible to lower forms of life or even to savage men. The point, the line, and the void space between two points are all connected with material objects, and the processes carried on in the cortex have enabled us to conceive them. But our consciousness is convinced that they exist independently of us, of all matter and of the cortex, and are not "an innate quality" of our phronema. The truths of mathematics, take the simplest that one and one make two, are appreciated only by means of the processes carried on in the cortex, but our consciousness is convinced that the truth exists independently of any machinery in the brain. If the machinery of my brain be defective, I shall not be able to cognize it just as a man who has lost his eyesight will not cognize the glories of the sun, which however exist independently of his eye. We have attained to certain subtle spiritual ideas which are still adjuncts of material ob-

jects. The living being in its progress will apprehend still subtler and mere spiritual ideas. It is doubtful whether these ideas will in time become wholly unconnected with material objects. As long as life will be connected with matter, the ideas will not be wholly immaterial. But life is becoming more spiritual and ideas are likewise becoming more spiritual with it, and for the more easy and perfect realization of these ideas, life evolves finer machinery in the brain. The word innate as applied to ideas is true in the sense that they become fully manifest only when the machinery of the brain is developed and perfected, but before that they exist in the mind without full realization and thus can be described as innate.

Haeckel says: "What seems to us to-day to be an innate quality of our phronema, is really a phylogenetic result of a long series of brain adaptations formed by *a posteriori* sense-perceptions and experiences"* This statement of biological facts may be accepted but it does not lead to the conclusion that there is no spirit as triumphantly asserted by the great biologist. Without doubt apprehension of *a priori* ideas is not "an innate quality of our phronema" and is thus independent of it and is not the "result of a long series of brain adaptations formed by *a posteriori* sense-perception and experiences." No amount of sense-perceptions, material experiences, permutations and combinations of brain-matter or any physical or chemical action can produce the conception of im-

*Wonders of Life p. 71.

material ideas, pure forms of mathematical truths and the like.* The long series of brain adaptation have slowly led to the capacity of the fuller and fuller realization of the pure spiritual ideas.

But there is one great fact in life which the materialist ignores. The living being is bound by the fetters of matter which it is always trying to break. It can scarcely have any thoughts and ideas unconnected with matter which the machinery of the body can convey to it. But it is always trying to transcend itself and create finer machinery for the realization of its desire to attain the spiritual. The living being is always creating finer and finer instruments in the brain-cells for the realization of the spiritual.

The process is necessary for the evolution of higher life. The living being gets for itself by laborious and continuous effort machinery in its constitution which makes its work easy. By long habit our inferences of reason become instinctive. The machinery in the brain mechanically does the work of reasoning and thus we act instinctively. Instinct has not only a fringe of intelligence, as Bergson says, but it is rational behaviour stereotyped, for the production of which new bodily machinery has been evolved. For the purposes of reasoning for which a living being has machinery in the brain ready-

*Haeckel rightly ridicules the idea of heaven as "a great blue vault spanning the earth" but his own idea of ether or matter or substance filling all the sky is no better than the idea of a great blue coating to the "vault spinning the earth," with nothing beyond. I mention this just to show that the absurdity to which pure materialism leads is no better than the absurdity of the position of the idealist.

made, it finds its work easy and it is relieved of the heavy strain, which was entailed upon it for such rational results before it had such machinery. It now goes forward to more complex, finer and more spiritual work. In course of time it evolves machinery for enabling it to do this higher work of reason. Thus it has been going on. The significance of instinct in life is great. It is not the characteristic of low form of life only but it is necessary for the progress of the highest forms of life.

This leads us to habits and instincts and to the questions whether the actions of living beings are merely automatic and whether there is any immaterial reason dominating them.

Now those scientists, that endow the atom or the Cosmos with intelligence and purposiveness and thus explain the orderliness of nature and the reason that we find in life, are not consistent materialists. But there are others who with greater consistency assert: 'Atoms are always in motion. Repetition of action or motion in particular atoms for a very long period produces tendencies, laws in material bodies which we call non-living, and habits and instincts in living beings. Tendencies of non-living bodies may produce life and its attendant phenomena'. This is a clear and lucid scientific position indistinguishable from the philosophy of Buddha, who asserted that from unconscious cosmic matter by process of constant repetition of a particular kind of change, impressions are produced which ultimately lead to consciousness. Buddha's rigidly logical mind

could not see causality in the phenomena. He said they are always found together but not as cause and effect, because in these phenomena about life, the preceding phenomenon itself could not exist without the succeeding phenomenon and the fact is made clear by the succeeding links of his well-known chain, where we find that consciousness of the agreeable and the disagreeable is followed by desire but without desire such consciousness is not explainable and would not exist. That is perfectly true and applies to all the phenomena about motion, change, tendency, behaviour, instinct &c. But this sequence of phenomena, in which the preceding link can not exist without the the succeeding link, shows that both are connected of necessity by a mediating something, without which they would not exist. Thus though dead matter or non-life may lead to the evolution of life, and motion or change oft-repeated may lead to tendencies, laws, instincts and reason, they are inter-dependent on one another, backward and forward, in Buddhist terminology, and are thus connected by a mediating something. This leads us to something beyond and above matter, beyond life and beyond reason but which is the mediating link connecting all phenomena and is the indispensable ingredient which produces all phenomena in dead nature and also in the world of life but is not identical with either, and the mysterious character of which is indefinable.

Habits are personal and not hereditary. Instincts are inherited from parents. In the elementary forms of life reproduction is carried on by the

entire body dividing itself into parts which become new living organisms. Next we come to division of labour in the functions of the body by the coming into existence of senses and sense-organs. The evolution in the sexes in the same body is the next phenomenon observable. The process of reproduction by the division of the same body is still going on. So far there is very slight variation in the individuals of the species. Last of all we come to the division into sexes in separate bodies. This leads to great variation in the individuals but the male and female bodies are practically the same body in which both the sexes existed together, which reproduced itself by division into parts. Thus the main characteristics of the species are reproduced in their entirety with personal idiosyncracies.

This brings us to the most important characteristic of life which distinguishes it from non-life. Even in the most elementary forms of life, which reproduce themselves by division, there is a rudimentary perception of personality and consequent volition. This alone can account for the reproduction and propagation of the species and for the rudimentary effort at self-preservation. This may not seem quite convincing to the materialistic biologist. But if he believes in the evolution of a more complex and higher species, a fact in nature vouched for by science, the result must be a consequence of some effort and consequently of some volition, necessitating the bettering of the individual and ultimately of the species, and most biologists do believe in such volition and effort producing the result mentioned.

Here the importance of the distinction between habits and instincts becomes apparent.

Instinct and habit are two facts, which according to godless science explain all the phenomena of life which are supposed to be non-material or spiritual. Even the laws of matter and the orderliness of nature are supposed to be results of habit by scientists. They explain all things. The primitive man ascribed diseases, storms, falling of trees, death of cattle and the like to ghosts, and even a specially troublesome tiger or a serpent was considered to be a ghost and often a god. The scientist can not easily get over this habit and is inclined to find an easy explanation of phenomena, which he finds difficult to explain. Inventing an idea and a word and ascribing mysterious and marvellous phenomena to their operation has been the habit of man from time immemorial. Instincts and habits have superseded ghosts and gods, and Nature has been substituted for the Supreme Being. Assertions on either side however are not proof. Let us examine what instincts and habits in life are.

Instinct and
habit.

The mechanisms of the body necessary for the carrying out of the functions of self-preservation, nourishment and reproduction evolved in the body "are set at work by naturally recurring external agencies with the operation of which previous experience and consequent memory" have surely something to do, but in as much as the operations are the effects of impressions so deep as to have become ingrained in the species as characteristics of the body peculiar to

that species, the effort and volition are so slight as to be scarcely perceptible. But they are there all the same, as without them life is not possible.

In life it is a fact undoubted, admitted by most biologists, that apart from the mechanical process of adaptation, idiosyncracies in individuals manifest themselves which lead to diversity and evolution of diverse and also higher species. This diversity in life has been considered by Udayana, the acutest theistic logician of ancient India, as proof positive of the existence of God. However that may be, these petty idiosyncracies of individuals of low organism leading to such marvellous results, show volition or purposiveness and effort, a fact admitted by most biologists. These actions peculiar to an individual oft-repeated become habits with him. When these habits on account of imitation or other causes become general in the individuals of a large section of the species for a long time, they tend to modify the structure of their body. When these habits are favourable to the evolution of a higher species, the structure is easily modified by a law dominant in life. These actions which were habitual with the individuals, become instincts of the newly-evolved species as a result of the modification of structure mentioned above. Thus peculiar habits, volition and effort, in conjunction with a supreme law of life, lead to the modification of the mechanism of the body, and sense-organs and thought-organs in the brain are evolved and become finer and more complex. When these organs are developed, the actions corresponding to them seem mecha-

nical. But as the species becomes higher and higher, with more complex bodily organization, effort and volition as the ultimate moving springs, which set them at work, come more and more to the surface and become apparent even to the most confirmed materialist. Thus the scientist is forced to the conclusion arrived at by Sir Ray Lankester that over and above instinct and habits which are all but automatic and unconscious, there is a third property of life which by gradual development becomes manifest in higher species, especially in man, which is called "conscious reasoning manifested by rational behaviour." This simple and obvious explanation will show that all the recent theories of materialistic science point to the existence in life of something apart from matter and its laws. This explains how much is inherited and how much is acquired. The fact of acquisition of new habits shows personality, conscious reasoning, volition and effort.

Sir Ray Lankester in a very recent article thus briefly described the result of the investigations of scientific men on this matter: "The automatic mechanisms of the mind can be divided into those which are 'innate' or 'inherited' and are (with slight variations, precisely alike in every individual of a species and ready to act in one definite way, as soon as the animal is grown—and on the other hand, those which are not inherited ready made, but are independently built up and formed in each individual as a result of its own experiences. These are the outcome of the inscription, as it were, of a record of the animal's ex-

periences upon its nervous system, to which we give the name "memory". Elaborate and consecutive actions of great importance to their safety, nourishment and reproduction, are carried out systematically by the lower animals by the operation of inherited mechanism—true instincts—in the formation of which individual experience and memory have had no part. The building of cells, such as those of bees and wasps, the laying of eggs in those cells, and the selection and storing in them of nourishment—are it is well ascertained, the result of the activity of mechanisms which are inherited by the insect, and are set at work by naturally recurring external agencies—heat, light, scents, pressure—each of a special and definite kind, with the operation of which previous experience and consequent memory have nothing to do. Memory, the formation of effective records, in the nervous tissue of the brain of the individual's own experiences may be "unconscious" and is so in all but the very highest animals. It is only in man that it is largely, so to speak, "illuminated" or accessible to that new and peculiar mental condition which we call consciousness; and even in ourselves there are large areas of memory, of the existence of which we are unconscious, and others of which we only become conscious under exceptional circumstances, dreams etc.

"It is a very important fact that the unconscious memory builds up mechanical mechanism similar to but distinct from those of instinct and more specially fitted to the needs of the individual than are those

of instinct, and therefore tending to replace them. They are to be called "habits" as contrasted with "instincts". They are not transmitted in the reproductive process from parent to offspring. They are acquired postnatal structure and have to be formed afresh by "education" in every individual. Inherited memories are not known to occur. So far as habits are independent of conscious control, they are like, hereditary instincts, "automatic" and have in consequence not been clearly separated from instincts by most writers on psychology.

"We have recognized two grades or kinds of mental mechanism, a lower hereditary kind called "instincts," a higher individually acquired kind called "habits"—the latter tending to supersede the former. We have to recognize a third kind, which must be called conscious reasoning manifested by "rational behaviour". Consciousness, the awareness of self and of the distinctness from self of that which is not self, can not exist without memory, the more or less extensive and permanent record of the individual's experience; although memory can and does very largely exist without consciousness".*

It is clear that rational conduct oft-repeated becomes habit. Habit long continued affects the structure and becomes hereditary and becomes instinct. This is the reason why we find that instinct is characterized by some degree of rationality and is

*Illustrated London News, 1919, July 12. Sir Lankester says positively in the articles that the new faculty that of conscious reasoning sets in or makes its appearance in man and in no lower creature. It is difficult to get rid of ancient superstitions.

"surrounded with a fringe of intelligence", as Bergson puts it,* because the living being has a dim consciousness of its origin in reason and instinctive conduct never completely loses its original character. When rational conduct has become instinctive and requires no effort on the part of the living being, it acts like a machine but it soon finds itself in the presence of new circumstances, which are outside the range of its instinct, and has to make a determination *i. e.* to exercise its intelligence or reason. It is not correct, as Bergson says, that "there is no intelligence in which some traces of instinct are not to be found." The living being undoubtedly makes use of its past impressions in making the comparison which leads to its determination and its habits and instincts colour its judgment and very often warp it. But the decision which leads to rational behaviour is opposed in its character to habit and instinct, which are unconscious and thus irrational. The "traces of instinct" supposed to exist in intelligence are the colour, which instinct and habit force upon it and which makes it partially irrational. Pure intelligence has no fringe or trace of instinct in it.

We have been hitherto assuming that volition and the power of determination are not properties of matter. But many biologists do not admit the position. Let us therefore consider the nature of the faculty of volition and the power of determination of the living being. Materialists and a large class of philosophers

*Creative Evolution translated by Arthur Mitchell p. 143.

deny their existence and assert that there is no free will, every action being determined by environments and the chain of past circumstances and impressions. Bain says: "Vivid recollection of any particular pleasure or pain is the motive for pursuing the one and avoiding whatever tends to the other. The common forms of prudence and imprudence are represented by a full or deficient recollection of good and evil which is the faculty usually said to be concerned in these cases ** The animal that has the best memory for whippings is the animal with the strongest will and the highest moral nature."* Herbert Spencer says that the feeling that we have freedom of will is a delusion arising out of the extreme complication of the forces in action. He says: "The composition of causes is so intricate and from moment to moment so varied that the effects are not calculable" and as in all physical phenomena human action only seems to be dictated by free will. That is also the opinion of most idealistic philosophers. Spinoza says: "Human liberty of which all boast consists solely in this that man is conscious of his will and unconscious of the causes by which it is determined". Leibnitz says: "As for free will I am of the opinion of the Thomists and other philosophers who believe that all is predetermined." Thus materialists, pantheists and those, who believe that every thing is determined by Karma, (a doctrine absolutely indistinguishable from the position of the materialist) or by God, agree that there is no free will and the living being is an automaton or a machine which the materialist has shown to be so defective as not to re-

* Study of Character.

flect the highest credit on the engineer who designed it. If the living being is either merely a clock or a wireless installation which records the actions of a heavenly manipulator, we need not trouble ourselves with it.

From the above statement, it is apparent that there is in reality no difference in the positions of Bain and of the idealist philosophers and they agree that there is no free will. According to the former, pursuing that which is pleasurable and avoiding what is painful and the recollection of past experiences are the origin of volition. Pleasures and pains are defined by the materialist, the former as what is beneficial and preserves the organism and the latter as what is hurtful to it. The living being however is able to appreciate these two facts and to make its selection. This power of selection involves freedom. It may be said that there is no power of selecting what is hurtful to the organism and thus volition is limited by the constitution of the organism, which again is the result of past material facts and circumstances. The admitted facts of "trial and error" made by living organisms show volition. Again action without free volition will not explain the evolution of the better. The living being not only makes its choice of such actions as are pleasant to its organism but over and above it, it is always making its best effort to attain to a state of existence better than the present. We find in nature that labour, trouble and pain alone lead to the evolution of the higher forces of life. This evolution cannot be a re-

result of the action of the living being which only selects that which is pleasurable. Pure matter, however manipulated or impressed with numberless past events, cannot produce something better than itself. The philosopher comes to the breach and says that God is the agent through whom the result is accomplished. God alone or God and past circumstances determine what is called the will of the living being. But here the scientist tells us that without irritation and pain and conscious effort of the living being, the sense-organs would not come into existence nor any higher forms of life. Thus matter or nature or the God conceived by philosophers on the model of nature or man will not explain the phenomena attendant on life.

Conscious effort is required for every action. The all but material rudimentary living organism is practically entirely subject to the influence of its environments and often seems indistinguishable from dead unconscious matter and "seems to have only one kind of reaction to every stimulus." The degree of freedom in the will depends on the degree of consciousness.

Even in the most rudimentary forms of life some degree of conscious effort is found. Professors Geddes and Thomson mightly say: "Jennings has shown that some unicellular animals 'behave' in a very definite way. They are not mere automata * * and are more than the mere slaves of stimulus. There are some whose behaviour illustrates what may be called "the method of trial and error." They

try one kind of reaction after another, until in some cases, they give the effective response."* Rudiments of purposiveness, power of determination and freedom of will are to be found even in the amoeba. The all but material organism is subject very nearly entirely to the influence of its environments. As the living being in its upward progress becomes more conscious, it feels its power over surrounding matter more and more and is able more and more to exercise a greater degree of free volition. Consciousness connotes freedom. It is true that I think therefore I am. It is also true that I feel therefore I am. It is truer still that I will therefore I am. Without freedom of action there is no life and no consciousness. Freedom of will depends on the fact of self-consciousness.

This brings us to the consideration of the character of memory and self-consciousness themselves. Are they wholly material. The position of the materialistic is thus well-described by Alfred Hook in his recent book.† He says, memory is of two kinds: (a) Functional memory or the power which living matter "possesses of retaining impressions and repeating past experiences," the intrinsic nature of this quality of living matter being altogether incomprehensible and beyond imagination, though it is manifest throughout the animate world from the simple cell to the most complex organism. (b) "The complex function of conscious memory in man and some of the higher animals" which is "de-

* Evolution p. 94

† Humanity and its problems by Alfred Hook.

lived from functional memory as a result of organic evolution". All evolution is supposed to be due to the joint action of the fundamental qualities of living matter described before, adaptability to new conditions and of the perpetuation of the new forms or characteristics produced. No outside influence is admitted in the process. The author then gives a description in the most approved modern scientific method of the process of the growth of plasma matter to rational man. He next goes on to show that from functional memory, which is "the non-conscious power of retaining the impressions of past experiences and a tendency to repeat them" is produced consciousness, which is a condition "in which a new impression from outside is accompanied by the revival in the functional memory of a similar past impression" and that there is no sharp line of distinction between the instinctive and the conscious states, the second being a mere development of the first". He then says: "As the faculty of consciousness develops and strengthens, it recalls old impressions with celerity (almost instantaneously in the higher types) and revives not only identical but similar impressions (those having one or more features in common with itself), while in a still more advanced stage, the single new impressions revives a number of similar past impressions. When this point is reached, the brain has acquired a primitive power of reasoning. A certain external stimulus revives in the field of consciousness a number of past impressions and experiences; and the action of the animal is determined by the most vivid

or most powerful of such impressions. The mental operation is identical with reason in man, though inferior in range. Thought is the process of revival of past impressions under the influence of some impression or stimulus; and the thinking power of a man depends upon the number and clearness of the past experiences and the ease with which they pass into the field of consciousness. Reason is a higher phase of the same process." He thus shows how reason and thought are the developments of the power of internal adjustment to changing conditions and memory, which are characteristics of living matter. He goes still further and shows that from consciousness proceeds self-consciousness. He says: "Among the earlier experiences of the conscious organism is the fact that its own body is related to itself in a peculiarly intimate way. The existence and nature of the external world are conveyed to the brain by the various organs of visions and the sense of touch that the foot of the animal is associated inseparably with the rest of the organism and that all the experiences of that foot are conveyed to the brain. These accumulating experiences under the influence of conscious memory create the sense or consciousness that the foot and other organs are dissociated from the external world and are inseparably associated with the organism itself. We have here the beginning of self-consciousness. The condition of consciousness is itself an experience of the brain and becomes a part of the brain's memory as the result of repetition. Self-consciousness

results from this. It is the consciousness of the organism of its own functions." He then says: "It may be noticed that in the lowest forms of life where consciousness has not developed, action under the influence of functional memory is entirely automatic or instinctive. Where development has not passed the stage of consciousness, it is mainly instinctive, and in a limited degree rational. It may further be observed that the rational is developed from the instinctive and covers but a small portion of the field of action. In man himself, most of his actions are still instinctive, and very few rational *i. e.* consequent on the mental process of reasoning". The author makes a distinction between consciousness and self-consciousness and seems to consider it identical with the distinction between instinct and conscious reasoning described by Sir Ray Lankester. Consciousness can only mean self-consciousness. The distinction attempted to be made between the two by materialists, without which their position is untenable, only shows the futility of all materialistic explanation of life.

The position of the modern materialistic biologist is hardly distinguishable from the great doctrine of Buddha. It should be described here. Buddha propounded no theory. But he showed a chain of sequences, which disproves all doctrines of materialism and pantheism and panpsychism. He said in Life we find the following: From something characterized by ignorance and unreason or *Avidya* proceed *Sanskara* or dim impressions or impulses,

which are imprinted on that by past events, movements and disturbances and retained by it. This is followed or accompanied by *Vijnana* or consciousness of the biologists. But Buddha was a master of psychology and saw clearly that consciousness means self-consciousness, or the consciousness of the Ego which agains connotes the consciousness of the non-Ego or the world outside the Ego. Next the perception of the non-Ego connotes the perception of Nama and Rupa *i. e.*, of forms and distinctions between things and thus of space and time and includes the power of discrimination. The perception of forms, though precedent in idea, is always found accompanied by the senses and the objects of the outer world of sensual perception, which are called the six *Ayatanas*. The Hindu philosophers say that the eye is produced by the consciousness of the existence of spatial forms. Indeed in the blind impulse or impressions, which mark the beginning of life, there is the dimly developed will to see. In the most elementary protoplasm there are the germs of the eye and the other senses. The eye and the other senses are thus the direct outcome of the latent will to see or hear or feel, acting on matter and directing it and developing by natural laws. To proceed with Buddha's famous law. Ideas of form, sense-organs and the objects of sense-perception are always found together. Next the senses and the outer world, the objects of the senses, have meaning or existence only by reason of *Sparsa* or contact with one another. Now this contact will not produce any con-

scious result, except by attention, which can only be produced by a sense of agreeableness or disagreeableness or *Vedana*. This sense of the agreeable and the disagreeable is always accompanied by the desire for the agreeable and for the repetition of the agreeable sensation, or *Trishna*. This is accompanied by seeking after the means of repetition of the pleasant sensation or *Upadana*. This is impressed on the world of life and is accompanied by birth. The desire for the exercise of the senses is accompanied by the objects upon which this can be done. Such exercise is accompanied by reproduction of life, which is always accompanied with growth, decay, pain, sorrow and death. Buddha did not attempt to lay down a casual chain. He only analysed life. The first links of his chain are identical with the facts found by biology which stops there and says the resultant phenomena are mysterious. Buddha goes further and explains them by psychological and spiritual principles, the truth of which requires investigation.

Hume in the nineteenth century demolished the idea of causation from the world of physical objects and now scientists express the idea in Mill's language as "invariable and unconditional concomitance". Four thousands years ago the clear intellect of Buddha perceived the great truth and he rejected the word cause. But he observed one remarkable fact in his *Chain*. The first link is followed by other links. But the chain may also be read backwards and the succeeding link may be regarded as the cause of the preceeding, for without it the latter can not exist.

Law of in-
variable con-
comitance.

Judged by the law of invariable concomitance, he must be considered to have been right in his boast to Mara, the tempter, that no flaw could be found in his *Chain* or Law.

The similarity between the Buddhism and modern materialistic biology is very strong. The Sanskara of Buddha is the power of retaining impressions and repeating past experiences or functional memory of the biologist, and Vijnana which proceeds from it is consciousness. Buddha probably meant by past experiences, the experiences of previous existences. But his later disciples Nagarjuna and Nagasena seemed to agree with the modern biologist, who says that past experience includes the past experience of the race. We have thus come back after 2500 years to the position of the author of the *Milinda Prasna*, which must lead the wise to seek Nirvana or extinction. The modern biologist is however less dogmatic and, unlike the Buddhist, acknowledges his ignorances of ultimate causes and frankly admits that he can not explain the phenomena of life by the known characteristics of matter and must assume the existence of living atoms or living matter, and that the intrinsic nature of the quality of such matter which produces reason and self-consciousness is incomprehensible and beyond imagination. That stalwart sceptic and pure scientist, Huxley, rightly says in his physiology, "what consciousness is we know not; and how it is that anything so remarkable as a state of consciousness comes about as the result of irritating nervous tissue is just as unaccountable as any other ultimate fact of nature."

There is another phase of consciousness to which materialistic speculative philosophers attach much importance, which also must be considered here. James Mill said: "The memory of a chain of states of consciousness is the evidence for belief in my identity." To John Stuart Mill this statement was not sufficiently materialistic. He therefore said that memory was not merely having a past fact recalled,*but "it was having the idea recalled that along with the belief that the fact, of which it is the idea, really happened and moreover happened to myself", and thus "the phenomena of self, and that of memory are merely two sides of the same fact". This apparently acute observation covered by a cloud of words does not conceal the central fact of a perceiving and remembering self, which is conscious of its unchanged identity enduring through the chain of states of consciousness. Consciousness of self is not dependent on memory of a chain of states of consciousness nor are memory of such chain and itself two sides of a fact not defined. Memory is merely an attribute of the mind which is all but purely mechanical and material in the rudimentary form of life which gradually casts off such character and becomes subject to a free purposive rational active agent.

Opinion
Mill.

Later materialistic and agnostic philosophers have modified the position of the Mills and they assert that change is the very essence of consciousness. Bain says: "Change of impression is an indispensable condition of our being con-

Change of
impression
and of con-
sciousness.

scious."* Herbert Spencer is more emphatic and dogmatic. He says: "It is admitted on all hands that without change consciousness is impossible. A uniform state of consciousness is in reality no consciousness; when the changes in consciousness cease consciousness ceases".† The glamour of great names and the force conveyed in their emphatic dogmatism make the majority of us to accept such a statement as truth. It would be difficult to reconcile the existence of individuality and of the personal God with this position.

The very essence of self-consciousness is the consciousness that I am or of the Ego and simultaneously with it, that something other than myself exists as an absolute fact. According to the materialistic position, this does not show the spiritual character of consciousness. But the great doctrine of Buddha lays down that the consciousness of the non-Ego is invariably accompanied with the consciousness of distinctions, of likeness and unlikeness between two objects, without which consciousness is not possible, and also with the consciousness of immaterial forms and ideas, for without the consciousness of forms and ideas, distinctions are not appreciable; and last of all it establishes that without Trishna or interest and desire no consciousness is possible. Thus the great non-believer established beyond doubt the existence of the spiritual element in self-consciousness.

*The Senses and the Intellect,

† Principles of Psychology.

Buddha, though his doctrine established the spiritual element in life, had no idea of the natural evolution of higher life through desire and will and effort. He considered these to be ignoble and direct causes of the constant change in life leading to inevitable pain, sorrow and death. He said all things, gods and men and even the Brahma are ephemeral and life in every form is impermanent

Some of his philosophic followers in later years developed this doctrine into the system of philosophy, called the Kshanikavada or the theory of momentary existence, which is identical with the theories of Bain and Herbert Spencer and Bergson in its essence. The Hindu philosophers whenever they discussed Buddhism delighted in tearing this doctrine into shreds, which however was not the true doctrine of Buddha nor of the early philosophers of his School. The Hindu philosopher rightly said that the consciousness of the Ego and the non-Ego and the apprehension of forms and ideas connote an unchanging spiritual element in self-consciousness. I feel, I desire and I will are more complex and material but there is a spiritual and unchanging element in them also. Memory, functional or ordinary, may be the recalling of past material impressions. This recalling is in the lower forms of life all but mechanical. But in higher forms, it becomes manifest that it is dependent on free volition, and is not wholly mechanical and material. It is admitted by most biologists, as mentioned before, that freedom of volition exists to a certain degree, even if in-

infinitesimal, in the lowest forms of life and it manifests itself and dominates matter more and more as life progresses in its upwards path to the spiritual. Even Haeckel has been driven to endow his living atoms with a rudimentary form of will or inclination. The fact of memory and free will prove the continuous and unchangeable element in self-consciousness as demonstrated by the ancient Hindu philosophers.

It does indeed appear at first sight that change of impressions is an indispensable condition of consciousness. That would prove the materialistic position. Philosophers, who with all their boasted idealism can never shake off material ideas, natural to us all men, accept it without appreciation of its logical consequences. But let us consider the matter. No doubt change of impression is necessary for consciousness. But as I have shown before there can be no impression without attention consequent on active volition, which connotes an active conscious agent to whom the material impression is carried by material phenomena outside itself. Secondly, it is not the change of impressions that is the cause of the manifestation of consciousness. A million images may be received by a mirror without consciousness. The change must be apperceived. The distinctions between one impression and another must be perceived to produce consciousness. It is not the change in the physical phenomena that produces consciousness. Something in the constitution of the living being apprehends distinctions in outside phenomena and this apprehension of distinctions is an apprehen-

sion of all but pure spiritual forms. *It is therefore not the change but the apprehension of the fact of the change, the apperception of distinctions, which characterizes the manifestation of consciousness. The self is something which so apprehends and perceives, and change of phenomena and impressions is no part of its consciousness. Again perception is not possible, if the perceiver is constantly changing. If the mirror is constantly changing it can receive no images. Further, perceptions are not possible without interest. That interest is an essential element of life. It is however possible only when there is a continuity in self-consciousness, when there is an Ego to feel it, to desire the object which excites it and to make the effort necessary to attain the desired object.

But it should not be understood that the perceiver of forms and distinctions, the agent that wills and creates, does not change. If it did not, it would be incapable of perceiving finer forms and of evolving higher and more spiritual life. Its constitution is always so changing that the forms and ideas in which sense-impressions are carried to it by the organs of the body become more spiritual, but the forms and ideas carried to it before the change are included in the finer later ones and thus there is continuity and no break in the chain. This is true of most facts and phenomena of life. Bergson rightly says that "the present contains nothing more than the past and what is found in the effect was already in the cause."

Change in
consciousness
necessary.

* I say all but spiritual as forms such as lines and triangles are not material but are not conceived except in connection with material object.

But after all, the principle mentioned above applies to the material phenomena of life and to the forms and ideas connected with non-life.

Difference
between
changes in
the material
and change
in the spiri-
tual.

With ideas connected with life very often there is no continuity.* The ideas of beauty, harmony goodness and the like so change that very often the later form is not only not a modification of the former but is contrary to it. Such complete change, which breaks altogether with the preceding form, is not possible in material entities however fine, not even in entities formed of space and time, of lines and points and moments and hours. That is what distinguishes the spirit from matter. Once it is admitted that such complete change is possible, the existence of the spiritual element in life is demonstrated. Bergson has demonstrated the fact that life is always changing and recreating itself, but immersed as he is in materialistic ideas of science, he has gone back to the old Buddhistic Kshanikabad. He has not perceived the fundamental distinction mentioned above. What is true of the material is not true of the spiritual. In the world of the spirit, the more spiritual is completely different from the less spiritual. There is no connection between the two. Michael Angelo had an eye and Beethoven had an ear quite different from the eye and ear of the ordinary man, though apparently there was no difference in their constitution from that of those organs in others. But their feelings and ideas were the very contrary of the feelings and ideas of savage

* The fundamental difference between these two descriptions of ideas shows the true character of the spiritual. It is described at p. 112.

men and even of ordinary civilized men. In ethics the fact is more manifest. There is a complete transformation however, not of the entire self, as Bergson thinks, but only of a very small portion of the spiritual element in the constitution of the living being. The complete transformation into the pure spirit is possible only when the material element wholly disappears. As long as there is the material element, any change must be mainly but not entirely of the character that the present contains in it the past. We know only of the change of the less spiritual into the more spiritual. We know all but nothing of the absolute pure spirit. The change into the more spiritual is only possible with the fact of the continuity of individual existence. The evolution of the more spiritual occurs only in life and if ever there was a complete break in life, things would be relegated to their primordial state and evolution of the more spiritual would be an impossibility. Life would rise from the sea of matter, like a water-sprout in the sea, as a result of some convulsion or as a consequence of some wonderful impulse spoken of by Bergson, but the sea of life or matter or Nature or the Brahman of the pantheist would resume its normal placid state, when these exudations or uprising, called living beings, cease to exist as individuals. We shall discuss the matter in greater detail in a subsequent chapter.

We have considered most of the doctrines of the biologists about the material character of life. The strongest ground of the materialist which has not

yet been sufficiently answered, has however not yet been mentioned. A man of strong intellect when he grows very old gradually loses not only the powers of the bodily organs but with them also gradually loses his powers of thought, appreciation of beauty, his moral sense and alas ! also his spirituality and love of God, and becomes even worse than those living beings which are hardly distinguishable from matter. The tragedy of the end of the life of Kant, the greatest of philosophers, the man who knew all things, is the tragedy of all life. How is this compatible with the spiritual character of the living individual entity, soul or ego ? By some process, which shall remain unexplained for some time yet, if not for all time, life is found in certain combinations of material substances. Such combinations grow, decay and die. There is another characteristic. It produces or attempts to produce another of the same species. In many forms of vegetable life, death follows as soon as the object of reproduction by producing the seed is fulfilled. Now these are the characteristics of life : growth, decay and death within a fixed limit of time, varying in duration in different forms of life, and reproduction and evolution of higher forms of life. Simple molecules do not grow nor die, nor do mere combinations of molecules, without extraneous influence do so. If molecules or combinations of molecules had the inherent property of growth, they would continue to grow till eternity, and there would also be no death for a living organism, if it

consisted wholly of a combination of molecules. The pure materialist can give no explanation of life, nor can pure matter in any way account for the phenomenon. What is death? It is the loss of the power of growth and of prevention of disintegration of the combination of atoms constituting the body of a living being. Decay and senility are, like other diseases, phases leading to death. They are parts of the phenomenon of death and if death does not establish the materiality of life decay and senility cannot do so.

It appears further that, as Bergson says, "consciousness lies dormant when life is condemned to automatism as in the case of parasites. It awakens as soon as the possibility of a choice is restored."* Indeed it has been established by modern surgery that on account of defective thyroids, the mind together with the body becomes "greatly embarrassed" and idiocy supervenes. When treated by administration of thyroid gland taken from sheep, the defective condition of the mind is cured. Similar conditions appear when brain-cells are deficient or diseased. Thus when the machinery through which the mind works, becomes weak and defective, the mind is embarrassed and even consciousness becomes dormant. That may happen in old age. But as in the case of parasites, it "reawakens as soon as the possibility of a choice is restored" by getting healthier machinery to work with. So if after death, as Hindus and Buddhists believe, the individual gets another body his

powers may revive as soon as he gets a fully working machine. The disembodied ghost must be as impotent as the dotard and the idiot. That is all that science can say.

Abnormal phenomena induced by disease or by freaks of nature, it is admitted, are of supreme importance in psychology and takes us to the roots of life and consciousness. Hysteria, clairvoyance and telepathy take us to very strange realms. Material theories of biologists can not explain them. Again, take facts as the following. "Pnyllis Whateley, the Black Daughter of the Sun, who when only eight years old, was ruthlessly torn away from her Negro parents on the wilds of Africa and sold to a white American. In six years, under the care of a kind master, she developed remarkable poetic powers and her writings in the English language extorted such general admiration that soon the white races on two continents paid her homage and the most learned scholars and celebrated writers of the world were forced to acknowledge her as a poetess of distinction and a woman of letters and genius." "Toussaint L' Ouverture, a pure-blooded Negro, the celebrated Haytian patriot and general, displayed a military genius which baffled the best generals of Spain and England and was further regarded as a statesman of the loftiest type". Most remarkable of all is the case of "blind Tom, a pure Negro, who was born sightless and nearly idiotic, had still implanted deep in the recesses of his benighted mind a most marvellous spark of musical genius. Descended from ancestors who had no idea of European music and little of music of any kind and

unable to read or write and scarcely able to tell his own name, he after listening once to the most difficult and complicated classical European music could sit down at the piano and could execute the piece as perfectly as the most accomplished master." The theory of gradual development of brain-cells, heredity and gradual evolution of greater reason and ethical and aesthetic powers is unable to explain the phenomena. They are either sudden irruptions of the spirit producing higher beings or they simply prove the continuation of a pre-natal existence. Accidents and freaks are to be found in nature. The theory of transmigration is not without its difficulties. So it is not proper to jump to a conclusion. But the theory of continued existence can not be dismissed lightly by science.

Sir Oliver Lodge one of the most eminent of scientists, in a lecture delivered on 16th May 1916, thus propounds what he considers the conclusions of science on the matter. After showing that "life is not energy any more than it is matter", he says:

"We may say that in the process of evolution there have been some great stages like Mendelian mutations. Starting with a uniform ether you may first suppose it organized into specks which we call electrons; then those electrons associate themselves into systems constituting atoms of matter, and from matter comes the whole inorganic universe. Then an astonishing departure comes,—the living cell or protoplasmic complex which life can utilise for manifestation or development. And after that, a brain

Lodge's
opinion.

cell, a physical organ for the rudiments of mind, followed by further mental development, until consciousness becomes possible with subsequent sublimation of consciousness into ethics, philosophy and religion.

"Something of this kind of devolution must have gone on in the mysterious course of time.

"Now I come to the meaning of the term "Death."

"Whatever life may really be, it is to us an abstraction, for the word is a generalized term signifying that which is common to animals and plants as well as to men. To understand life, we must study living things to see what is common to them all. An organism is alive when it moulds matter to a characteristic form and utilises energy to its own purposes; a living organism so far as alive, preserves its complicated structure from deterioration or decay.

"Death is the cessation of that controlling influence over matter and energy, so that thereafter we see the effect of uncontrolled activity when chemical and physical forces supervene. Death is departure or separation or severance of the abstract principle from the concrete residue. The term only applies to that which has been living.

"Death may therefore be called dissolution, separation—the separation of the controlling entity from the physico-chemical organism. It may be spoken of in general and vague terms as the separation of soul and body—if soul is used in its lowest denomination.

"At any rate, death is not extinction. Neither the soul nor the body is dead or out of existence. The body weighs just as much as before; the only properties it loses at the moment of death are potential properties. And all we can assert concerning the vital principle is that it no longer animates that particular organism".

"As vitality diminishes, the bodily determination known as old age sets in; something beyond deterioration results in death. It turns out, on enquiry that old age and death are not essential to living organism. They represent the wearing out of certain power, so that organism is hampered and cannot achieve results that the younger machine could.

"The parts which wear out are accreted, or supplementary, portions appropriate to developed earth life. It does appear probable that the progress of discovery will postpone the deterioration which we call old age for a longer time than at present.

"Death appears to be the prerogative of the higher organism, and seems to have been introduced because it was useful to the race. Continued life of the individual beyond a certain stage was not practically useful. So with the higher organism death was introduced, "not from absolute intrinsic necessity," says Weissmann, "but on grounds of utility."

"Rather, he is emancipated, freed from the burden of the flesh, though he has also lost the terrestrial activity which bodily mechanism conferred upon him. His accustomed machinery for activity has been lost, or rather it is out of action, it is dead."

He then dealt with the abuses and superstitions, which have resulted from associating the idea of continued personality with the dead body and concentrating attention on graves, worms, and epitaphs and went on to say :

"There is no extinction. The change called death is an entrance to a new stage of existence. Life is continuous ; the conditions of soul existence remain precisely as before. Circumstances have changed for the individual, but only in the sense that he is now aware of a different group of facts. The change of surroundings is a subjective one."

The above arguments were adduced as leading to the proof of the reality of ghost-life after death. The ghost has not the machinery to act and can not be better than the idiot or the old man in his dotage and thus the great scientist forgets his main facts in his inference. There is however, a great deal of truth in his statement of facts.

Haeckel, in attempting to establish that there is no life after the dissolution of the body, says that living beings normally 'find the end of life in old age or senility, by the gradual decay of the organs and the dwindling of their functions. The cause of this senility and the ensuing natural death is determined for each species of organism by the specific nature of their plasm. As Kassowitz has lately pointed out the senility of individuals consists in the inevitable increase in the decay of protoplasm and the metaplastic part of the body which this produces. Each metaplast in the body favours the inactive break-

up of protoplasm and so also the formation of new protoplasts. All these normal processes of senile decay are caused by chemical changes in the plasm.* The death of the cells follows, because the chemical energy of the plasm gradually falls off from a certain height, the acme of life. The plasm loses more and more the power to replace by regeneration, the losses it sustains by the vital functions* Haeckel concludes by asserting that "the natural physical explanation of death * * has shattered the naive belief in a conscious Providence or loving Father in heaven." He further says that "when our monistic and rational conception of death is described as dreary and hopeless, we may answer that the prevalent dualistic view is merely an outcome of hereditary habits of thought and mystic training in early youth." The biologist could not escape the temptation of solving insoluble problems by a manipulation of words and technical terms and ideas. No chemical, physical or material entity or energy is characterized by growth, decay and death. The example of crystal mentioned by Haeckel shows that after growth by assimilation of matter from outside, to a certain limit, there is a division but there is no dissolution. The same is true of unicellular organisms. Weissman says unicellular organisms are immortal. In that sense Haeckel says multicellular organisms are also deathless, as parts of them survive. Unlike crystals and unicellular organisms, when there is a complete permanent cessation of the activities of an

*The Wonder of Life p. 108.

individual living being, we call it death. That is not a property found in matter, energy or force.

It is not necessary further to describe the futile attempts of biologists to explain the phenomena attending life in terms of chemistry and physics. Herbert Spencer was "obliged to confess that life in its essence cannot be conceived in physico-chemical terms." It is generally admitted by scientists, as Professor McDougall says, that "no single organic function has yet been found explicable in mechanical terms", and properties and laws of matter will not explain birth and growth, decay and death.

In life alone we find growth, decay and death. Anything material has not got that characteristic. Matter does not decay or die. The pure spirit also does not decay and die. The living organism is neither wholly material nor wholly spiritual. Therefore it grows, decays and dies. Life is a mediating process by which matter is slowly and gradually transmuted into pure spirit. The question is, does the individual, which goes through these experiences, cease to exist with its body? If matter does not die, if the unicellular organisms do not die, if the spirit does not die, an entity, the subject of the process of the evolution, by which matter is transmuted into spirit, may also be immortal. We shall know more and better in course of time.

The very great service which biology has done is that it has established the fact that birth and growth and reproduction, decay and death are indispensable for the evolution of higher forms of life. Weissmann truly said that "in the higher or.

ganism, death was introduced not from absolute intrinsic necessity but on grounds of utility." That is also Sir Oliver Lodge's opinion. "Death was the price paid for a body" says Professor Thomson. It is clear that if there were no reproduction and birth and death, there might only be some living atoms and nothing better in this universe. Division into sexes, variation and evolution of the higher form and greater individuation are phenomena dependent upon one another. If the evolution of the higher form of life was not a necessity,—a law of life,—there would be no growth, reproduction, decay and death. Thus the tragic facts of decay and death are necessary for and show the fact of the evolution of the more spiritual form of life. But what of the individual? That is a very difficult question which will be considered fully in a separate chapter. What is clear for our present purposes is that the evolution of the more spiritual form of life is a fact of life, and decay and death do not disprove the existence of the spirit, as these are necessary for and lead to the evolution of the spiritual. The difficulty of explaining the facts of inevitable decay and death led to Buddha's position. Buddha went deeper into the realms of the spirit than the modern materialistic philosophers and asserted that desire and effort to realize the objects of desire are at the root of life. But he found that they led to reproduction, sorrow and death, and he and all philosophers after him declared desire and the effort to realise it as utterly foolish and ignoble. But Buddha was not aware of the law of evolution, how from desire, effort, pain, decay and death, proceed higher forms of life, how reason,

and goodness and the spirit are the direct outcome of those facts of life. Indeed, desire and labour and pain and death are not only not ignoble and results of ignorance but they are utterly noble to the eye of true wisdom. That entirely changes the situation. There is a great spiritual purpose in the fact that individuals have to go through the experiences of sorrow and labour, old age and death and it is probable that it does not cease to exist with the death of the body.

Let us now see where the facts of biology and the considerations described above lead us.

How the im-
material is
evolved from
the material.

(1). We find that most biologists admit that "even in the humblest manifestations of life are to be found traces of an effective psychological activity"* The eminent histologist E. B. Wilson was of opinion that "the study of the cell on the whole seemed to widen rather than to narrow the enormous gap that separates even the lowest forms of life from the inorganic world"† It has never yet been found that life was produced otherwise than from life. But science has been steadily so advancing as to pull down the barriers, which seemed to be insuperable before, between life and organic matter and also between the organic and the inorganic‡. Tyndall felt compelled by intellectual necessity to discern in matter "the promise and potency of all terrestrial life." However that may be, it is true that the rudimentary forms of life are hardly distinguishable from matter and the dividing line between the

*Bergsons Creative Evolution.

†The Cell in the Development and Inheritance New York p. 330.

‡Moore's Origin and Nature of Life p. 153.

living and dead matter has not yet been defined. Nevertheless, it is a fact that life is progressive and, as it progresses, it becomes more and more distinct from matter. Bergson is right when he says: "The life that evolves on the surface of our planet is indeed attached to matter. But everything happens as if it were doing its utmost to set itself free from the laws of inert matter. In reality life is a movement; materiality is the inverse movement" and life is "more than any thing else a tendency to act on matter."* Lord Kelvin rightly said, as mentioned before, that the power of the living organism of directing the motions of moving particles is a demonstrated daily miracle. This power over matter and freedom from the fetters of matter increase with the progress of life; and to be sure there is a law in nature by which life progresses, for embryology has conclusively demonstrated that even the highest forms of life have sprung from very elementary forms. What is the explanation of this marvellous phenomenon of the evolution of the immaterial or of the increasingly less material form from the wholly material?

Professor Moore rightly says that the whole living world depends upon the building up of the energy of the sun-light into the chemical energy of organic colloids which constitute living structure.† Life by itself can not maintain itself or develop. On the other hand, effort is the very essence of life and

*Creative Evolution p 263. 102.

†The Origin and Nature of Life p. 177.

as, Bergson rightly points out, there is a strong tendency in life to cease from effort and to revert to dead matter. It is by strenuous effort that the living being lives and preserves itself from being matter again, from being absolutely quiet and from attaining Nirvana, a state to which it is always being dragged down. But its own effort is insufficient to maintain the organism without sun-light. Any combination of matter and sun-light however, can not produce higher life, conscious reasoning, goodness and spirituality and freedom from the fetters of matter. The co-operation and help of an Influence, distinct from matter, is indispensable for the result. It may be possible that the simple structure of the rudimentary organs may be formed by peculiar combinations of certain descriptions of matter and the structure may be accompanied with function consisting originally in simple motion. But it is not conceivable that any complicated and extraordinarily delicate structure like the eye can so come into existence. Further, seeing and the attention and desire necessary for seeing can not be produced by chemical or physical action. Sun's rays acting on the pigment grain, it is inconceivable, can of itself produce the eye. Nor can the rudimentary organism do so of its own effort and volition, unless it is almighty. There is undoubtedly a connection between the ideas of form, the desire to realize them and the evolution of the eye. But without an outside Influence, all this must be unavailing. Again without such Influence, it is not conceivable that life,

which probably springs from matter, which is bound to matter and is dependent for its existence on an external material object like the sun, can throw off the fetters of matter solely of its own effort.

2. We have seen the facts found by biologists about reason. They find that reason and thought require fine instruments in the brain for their exercise and manifestation and some say that they are no better than functional memory. Functional memory, instinct and habit will explain much that is considered rational conduct by man. Most men are guided by these and by the opinions of others and say what they read in the newspapers and books. It is difficult to say what part of our conduct is not guided by these influences and we can not say any one of our opinions and actions are not merely mechanical. Nevertheless, it cannot be said that reason and thought are no better than functional memory in a complex and developed form. But we cannot ignore the facts of biology. Life in its rudimentary form was little better than irrational matter. Slowly, we find memory, habit and instinct developed and gradually we come to conscious reasoning. We are convinced that pure reason exists. But all our thoughts are all but material and it is difficult to say that our reason is spiritual. But what is an undoubted fact is that our thought and reason are every day becoming more and more freed from the fetters of matter. Thus with the evolution of higher life, reason is becoming more and more distinct from matter and energy and all properties of matter *i. e.*,

asserting its true character of immateriality and spirituality.

Philosophers and scientists agree that there is an innate intelligence, either in nature as a whole or in all atoms or in some atoms, which evolve the orderliness in nature and reason in man and thus avoid the necessity of God. The theory of design has long been considered as obsolete.* Its place has been taken by intelligence innate in nature and a sea of life and intelligence. The all but supernatural intelligence and prescience displayed by the horse-fly and the wasp, as described below, are ascribed to this innate unconscious impersonal intelligence, which is a property of matter or of something else, or are explained away by calling them instinct, ignoring the fact that instinct is founded on intelligence, which is of a character beyond the capacity of the low organism which displays it. Take another instance. Paul Janet in his well-known book on final causes, attempting to establish the doctrine of design, speaking of the eye says : " The Sclerotic membrane must become transparent in one point of its surface, so as to enable luminous rays to pierce it ** ; the cornea must correspond exactly with the opening of the socket ** behind this transparent opening there must be refracting media ** ; there must be a retina at the extremity of the dark chamber ** perpendicular

* There are scientists who would even ascribe design to the evolution of life but will not yet mention God. Professor Moore says "There is continuity and consistency in it all; there is beauty in it and design in it. There is a scheme in it all and an eternal purpose which is ever progressing" and he says that in consequence "there comes a touch of illumination and faith that kindles something sacred within the mind akin to reverence and awe." This impersonal design and eternal progressive purpose has become fashionable.

to the retina there must be an innumerable quantity of transparent cones permitting only the light directing in the line of their axes to reach the nervous membrane" &c. Bergson quotes the above and says:* "In reply, the advocate of final causes has been invited to assume the evolutionist hypothesis. Every thing is marvellous indeed, if one considers an eye like ours in which thousands of elements are co-ordinated in a single function. But take the function at its origin, in the infusorian, where is reduced to the mere impressionability (almost purely chemical) of a pigment spot to light: This function, possibly only an accidental fact in the beginning, may have brought about a slight complication of the organ which again induced an improvement of the function. It may have done this directly, through some unknown mechanism, or indirectly, merely through the effect of the advantages it brought to the living being and the hold it thus offered to natural selection. Thus the progressive formation of an eye as well contrived as ours would be explained by an almost infinite number of actions and reactions between the function and the organ without the intervention of other than mechanical causes." Bergson then exhaustively shows from facts of biology, especially from the phenomenon of the similarity between the eyes of vertebrates and of molluscs, which separated from their common parentage long before the appearance of an eye so complex as that of the mollusc that the mechanical theory is untenable. He points out that

*Creative evolution p. 64 from which the quotation from Paul Janet's *Les Causes Finales* is taken.

Mechanism
and finalism
both untenable

"the mechanism of the eye is composed of an infinity of mechanisms, all of extreme complexity. Yet vision is one single fact". He finds that light is a physical cause bringing about the formation of the eye and makes the hypothesis that "light acted directly on the organized matter so as to change its structure and somehow adapt this structure to its own form". The resemblance of two effects mentioned above would then be explained by the identity of the cause. He rightly concludes that the hypothesis of mechanism is not tenable nor is the doctrine of finalism or an effect, resulting inevitably from a preconceived design, which he rightly says is not distinguishable from mechanism, applicable to life. Life is, like organization, which "works from the centre to the periphery. It begins in a point, that is almost a mathematical point, and spreads around this point by concentric waves which go on enlarging."* He ascribes evolution and variety in life, not to God, but to what he calls an "original impetus of life." Finalism, which excludes freedom of action of living beings, is incompatible with the facts of life as found by biology. Purposiveness, adaptation, free volition and effort are characteristics of life and are indispensable for evolving variety and higher forms of life. Variations "spring from the very effort of the living being to adapt itself to the circumstances of existence," and this "implies consciousness and will," say Bergson and Cope.† An "original empetus, I mean an

*Creative Evolution p. 97.

†Creative Evolution p. 80. See Cope's Origin of the Fittest and Factors of Evolution.

internal push," says Bergson, "has carried life to higher, and higher destinies."* The internal push is indistinguishable from innate quality of matter or life. But all the qualities of matter and life, as has been shown before, in themselves are not sufficient to produce the result. The co-operation of a higher power is necessary. The more and more complex eye would be something like "the deeper imprint of light on matter which, being organized, possesses a special aptitude for receiving it",† says Bergson, but he also shows that this is not sufficient. The first rudiment of the eye is the pigment spot of the lower organisms, and this spot may indeed have been produced physically by the mere action of light. But the evolution of the highly complex eye must be an effect of purposive adaptation. Bergson has conclusively shown that the ordinary power of adaptation of rudimentary organisms is not sufficient to produce the result. An outside influence is necessary which he calls original impetus.‡ An impetus or push ordinarily proceeds from some agent. Bergson will not have a personal God. The idea of God as having created for six days and resting since then, as

*Créative Evolution p. 107.

† Créative Evolution p. 73.

‡ Heraclitus and his followers believed in a divine reason immanent in the world "reaching", like Wisdom in the Wisdom of Solomon, (VIII. 1.), "from one end to another mightily and sweetly ordering all things". But they conceived it not as an immaterial spirit but as of a fiery nature" (Webb's History of Philosophy). From this we have some idea of what modern philosophers and biologists mean by "original impetus," living atoms and tropisms and mind stuff in atoms and innate or potential intelligence of Nature. These are merely attempts by the learned to satisfy their own doubting hearts and the hearts of others, which can not conceive life as wholly material, by coining words and phrases which may seem to convey an impression of life being spiritual but which are really intended to invest it with imaginary subtle properties of matter.

inculcated in the Bible, has been considered the only possible idea of God. That idea is surely untenable with the facts of life as found by science. But the idea of original impulse or push is no better than the impetus or push given in ancient times by a God now quiescent, notwithstanding all the occult powers ascribed to it, notwithstanding all the analogies to streams and other word-pictures of Bergson, and is equally untenable and incompatible with the idea of ever new creations. The true God is always creating higher and higher forms of life, and He alone explains all the phenomena of nature and life.

It is a remarkable fact that 1200 years ago the great theistic philosopher Udayana, whose logic alone, it is alleged, was able to vanquish the Buddhists, advanced the identical reasons, mentioned by Bergson for the hypothesis of a stream of life as conclusive proof of the evidence of God. He mentions that because all phenomena of life are not wholly independent, because the stream of life is flowing eternally, because there is an infinite variety and because they associate and dissociate and grow from one one atom to manifold forms, God is demonstrated".* Great minds often see things in the same light. Here however, Udayana must be considered as more acute and having the clearer vision. To go back to Bergson. He says "the eye is not made to see but we see because we have eyes." This is a very unphilosophic statement. Surely, we do not see because we have eyes. We

*Nyaya Kusumanjali Ch. I, Sec. 4.

cannot see unless we desire to see and fix our attention on an object. The statement that light produces the eye by continuous action on living matter and puts its imprint on it and somehow adapts the structure to its own form, is a philosophic phantasy. If there were only light and no other object in the heavens, except a living organism, even if eyes were evolved by the action of light, it is clear there will be no vision but a dreary sensation of existence worse than the dreariest hell fancied by the gloomiest religious poet. Seeing connotes perception of forms. Multiple forms are necessary for seeing. Thus even more than light, are ideas of form essential for seeing. Light and eyes are necessary for the realization of those ideas of form and of the beauty that is in them and which they impart to nature and make it attractive to life. Philosophers and materialistic scientists are all agreed that mind and matter are related, and they have deduced either philosophic or materialistic monism from the fact, ignoring the facts of free volition and desire. There is an undoubted inter-connection between the mode of motion called light, the wonderful organ the eye and the ideas of form and the desire and effort of the living being to realize them. But the wonderful results proceeding from them,—the marvellous eye, the still more marvellous ideas of beauty ever-growing finer, the problems of geometry and astronomy, the grandeur of the universe, which is a creation of the living being and not an effect of matter and force—can not be brought about solely by the continuous action of electro-magnetic waves on the

all—but—wholly material living organisms or solely by the efforts of the all—but—unconscious organism hardly distinguishable from matter. To believe such a phenomenon possible is to believe in the most extravagant of fairy tales. Again sorrow and the like, which are immaterial effects produced on self-consciousness by external causes, which are both material and spiritual, can not be explained away as produced by the living organism itself or merely in commerce with matter, except on the Vedantic theory of Maya or self-illusion, for even "the amoeba is no fool" and will not produce sorrow willingly. Sorrow and joy and progress and higher life are all dependent, as Udayana rightly says, on an Entity other than matter and self. No original impulse, no entelechy, no mechanical theory, no immanent impersonal God can explain the result. The properties of matter, the increasing power of life over matter, the free volition of living beings and their effort are all necessary for the phenomena of progressive life. But they are by themselves not sufficient without an outside Influence, without the co-operation of a God without whom there would be no law and no reason and beauty, becoming better and higher and no spiritual destiny for life.

3. Next we come to consciousness. At the beginning, the living organism is all but unconscious. Up to a certain stage, biologists say, it is only conscious but there is no self-consciousness.* That is a fallacy, for consciousness means self-conscious-

*Hegel one of the greatest of philosophers describes the "progress from consciousness to self-consciousness, from this to the law-discovering and law-

ness. But the fact is that self-consciousness slowly comes more and more to the surface and becomes keener and keener. The lower forms which reproduce by division can scarcely be said to have a single individuality. But it is true, as Bergson says: "The tendency to individuate is every where present in the organized world, it is everywhere opposed by tendency to reproduction. For the individuality to be perfect, it would be necessary that no detached part of the organism could live separately". "We may conclude that individuality is never perfect and that it is often difficult, sometimes impossible to tell what is an individual and what is not, but life nevertheless manifests a search for individuality, as if it strove to constitute systems naturally isolated, naturally closed"† "Individuality admits of any number of degrees" is true. But life means individuality; "consciousness is at the origin of life".‡ It is imperfect in the beginning and it is hardly distinguishable from matter and it is "hard to decide what is individual and what is not". But slowly individuality develops and becomes greater and keener. The question is, is it not, from the beginning, of such a character as to be considered indestructible. It is undoubtedly true that it is so developing, and we may without any hesitation infer that it shall in time assume a form that is indestructible. Whether the individuality of

giving reason, from this to art and religion, and finally from this to absolute knowledge". This is simply trying to adopt imperfect biological speculations of his time and adding to them "absolute knowledge". What is absolute knowledge? What is the distinction between consciousness and self-consciousness? The process of the evolution of reason and ethics as found by biology is very different from Hegel's.

† Creative Evolution, p. 15.

‡ Ibid p. 275.

animals and of men is of such a character and whether life at all stages is eternal are problems which are difficult of solution.

What we find from biology is that individuality is an ingredient of life, which becomes greater and keener with the evolution of the higher life, and becomes more and more spiritual and more and more emancipated from the fetters of matter. There is no doubt, consciousness, like reason and will and every other spiritual faculty, seems bound up with certain cerebral and nervous structure. But we have seen before that function and structure react upon each other. The living organism, no sooner it gets a certain structure enabling it to have the spiritual faculties in a certain measure, immediately is dissatisfied with its condition and desires and strives after a higher spiritual condition, and the structure, we find, is improved to enable it to entertain more complex and higher thought, nobler ethics and to feel keener consciousness. Thus the process is going on. It shows that our reason and ethics, volition and consciousness have a material element in their constitution. But more complex and more delicate structure and corresponding more subtle thought and the like show that there is an "effective dominance of the mechanical factors by purposive guidance towards specific end or goal," as professor Mc Dongall rightly observes, and that there is a spiritual element in life which comes more and more to the front. The living being desires and by its desire and effort brings into existence the

structure. It shows its power over and independence of matter. An incessant and strenuous effort to cast off the fetters of matter is the chief characteristic of life. Perfect reason, ethics and personality will require no material structure for manifestation. The question is until that stage is reached, is individuality short-lived and bound up with the body in which it manifests itself?

Absolute self-consciousness is wholly spiritual and can not be ephemeral. It is also difficult to conceive of self-consciousness in any form as not spiritual or as a quality arising out of a combination of matter and energy. But it is nevertheless a fact that it becomes greater and grows with the evolution of the higher life. If it be true that self-consciousness is no part of matter, there is nothing to prevent its continuance. But like reason, in life we find that from an all but material form it gradually becomes less and less material and more and more spiritual. So far as it is spiritual, it is eternal. Matter does not die nor does spirit. It is the combination of matter and spirit, it is the combination of two indestructible entities that strangely enough produces what is called death. So far as the material constituents of the organism are concerned, on death they are not lost and continue to exist for ever, only they are disintegrated into atoms. But what of its spiritual component? If it is wholly material and is something like energy it is not lost. But so far as it continually grows and becomes more and more spiritual and differentiated from the material,

Conscious-
ness and
death.

it is distinguishable from energy or any quality arising out of combination of matter. These latter are constant and can not become greater. But life is constantly assuming absolutely new and higher forms, wholly distinct from its original forms.

The phenomenon called life is indestructible. The only question is, is the phenomenon called individual life indestructible? Philosophers and scientists make a distinction between life and individual life, between consciousness and self-consciousness. But life apart from individual life is not known and can not be conceived and consciousness means in reality self-consciousness. Thus if life and consciousness are indestructible, individual life is also indestructible. But it changes and becomes better and more spiritual and apparently dies, and we have no direct proof that it continues after the dissolution of the body nor can we conceive that it can manifest itself and work without the physical machinery of the body.

Further the self is always changing. Life itself has been described as a constant transformation. What we were at birth, we are not at ~~childhood~~, the self of the youth is different from that of the boy, the self of the old man is different from that of the youth. Bergson says that "our personality shoots, grows and ripens without ceasing. Every moment it is not only something new but something unforeseeable." "We are creating ourselves continually." This is not quite correct, because there is a continuity between the self of the boy and that of the old man. His memory testifies to the fact.

The material machine, which records past experience, does not wholly change and the person or agent, who by an act of volition recalls the experience, does not also wholly change. But when the self becomes more spiritual it becomes more distinct from the material and thus from its former state and more and more the master of the machinery and less and less an automaton. Life evolves spirituality very slowly and we are more material than spiritual, and it is difficult for us to conceive how self-consciousness changes and how it will continue when its tenement of clay is destroyed. There are philosophers who consider individual life as a wave in the ocean of life or as the result of an original common impetus and that the divergent manifestations flow from one original stream of life. There is a great deal of truth in the theory, only it is not consistent with the fact of the never-ceasing growth of individuality.

Biology tells us that reproduction and the necessity of the evolution of the higher forms of life is the reason of the death of an organism. Is the individual therefore a sacrifice necessary for the evolution of the Good, the rational, the spiritual? "What is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul" truly said Jesus, as also did Gargi, the wife of Yagnavalkya the seer, a thousand years before him. This poignant question has been asked by man since he attained to the state of conscious reasoning. If the soul is inevitably to be lost, nothing matters in life and in the universe. It is difficult to prove the facts of the spiritual world by reasoning

derived from material analogies. We shall, as we go on, continually consider this question and the greater question, that relating to God, and we may find that both questions ought to be answered as theism requires.

Entelechy,
republic of
cells and in-
creased indi-
viduation

There is another view of the matter. Some scientists are satisfied if some incorporeal agent is found in the living organism. Hans Driesch undoubtedly gave very strong reasons in his Aberdeen Gifford Lectures for holding that it is established that it was necessary to postulate an immaterial autonomous factor "entelechy." We can not however ignore the fact that a living organism in its more complex and higher form consists of innumerable living cells or lower organisms, which act together and produce unified action. Postulating an autonomous factor, entelechy, does not help us much. How can innumerable autonomous factors or entelechies produce one higher entelechy and further how is it possible for such entelechy to develop into a higher entelechy? Again, President Stanley Hall rightly says that "the soul of man is no whit less the offspring of animals than is his body. The ascending series of gradations is no more broken for the *Psyche* than for the *Soma*."* These are facts: the higher organism is composed of innumerable living cells, and intellect and other spiritual powers are growing, and individuality has grades and grows. It is not however possible to deny individuality to man, because his body is composed of highly organized material combinations and fine structures and also of innumera-

* Fifty Years of Darwinism.

ble living cells which might have some kind of lower order of individuality, or because consciousness has grades. Innumerable lower individuals may merge themselves practically in a higher individual without wholly losing their own individuality. They are very like organized matter and the little individuality they possess may be exercised without materially affecting the exercise of the higher individuality of man. Probably the exercise of the little volition and effort of the cell is necessary for the vital processes of the organism of man. Man has but little freedom and individuality himself, so little indeed that scientists consider him to be an automaton. How much more like mere matter and automaton is a living cell? The fact seems to be that "increased individuation" accompanies evolution of the more complex and higher forms, the bodily actions of which depend on lower organisms having very imperfect individuality. The theory of a republic of cells is untenable. The theory of Bergson that by its very constitution, as the living organism becomes more complex, living cells composing its own organism are evolved as parts of its own constitution, is merely stating a fact and not explaining it. Bergson however further says that "the individual makes the cells by dissociation." This is difficult to understand, except on the hypothesis that the individual makes the living cells to come into existence by subdividing its own constitution or organism, which is consistent only with pure materialism.

Higher life
depends on
lower life.

There are however certain facts which are undisputed. Life, though attached to matter and all but material at the beginning and even in the case of the high organism man, very nearly wholly under the domination of material forces, makes use of matter and tries to throw off its yoke and to make itself its master. The higher animals make use of the lower animals. Man uses not only the forces of nature but also the lower animals his slaves. It is possible that the higher organisms can use the lower animals just as they use matter for food and for the other purposes of life. The living cells are very nearly all but material. Digestion and every function can be carried on by means of absolutely material things together with living cells, which intervene between matter and higher life. Higher life depends on lower life. Greater individuation means greater freedom from the power of matter and also from the power of other living organisms. The gradation in individuality is necessary for the preservation and progress of life.

Absolute
individuality.

Bergson is right when he says that in life absolute individuality is not possible. Individuality grows and expands with the progress of life. It is a fact of biology. It is opposed to all materialism and atheism and pantheism. Individuality connotes freedom and is inconsistent with pure materialism. An ultimate substance, Nature or God, which is impersonal *i. e.*, without individuality, is opposed to greater individuation being a characteristic of higher life. Without constant free and conscious effort,

there would be parasitism and life would slowly lose individuality and revert to its original unconscious impersonal material condition. A God who has predestined all actions of life and has denied free volition and effort to his creatures, would surely lead them back to parasitism and unconscious matter. An impersonal God is also inconsistent with the fact of individuality always becoming greater and greater and nearer and nearer to absolute individuality. The absolute individual is the being who is free from all bonds of matter and whose intelligence, volition and power are not limited by any cause. He gives meaning to all life. It is only in reference to the absolute Individual, who is beyond the world of life, that life has any value, as we shall demonstrate fully in another chapter. The idea of a growing and expanding consciousness with ever-growing reason, with ever-becoming finer sense of the beautiful and the good, which finds newer and newer meaning in the dead world of matter, by *creating* out of it a surpassingly beautiful world of colour and sound, of beauty and music and by *creating* out of life surpassingly glorious forms of goodness, is marvellous beyond words. This result is possible if there is God, the absolute Individual, whose existence is connoted by our imperfect, undeveloped life and increasing individuation in time.

3. Let us consider ethics. That also is said to be no better than functional memory. Instinctive recognition of acts as avoidable because of punishment from individuals, society or state may be con-

ceived as proceeding from functional memory and self-regard. But we find that with the evolution of higher life, ideas of ethics are evolved which are less and less connected with functional memory or things material. Further what is marvellous beyond words and against all laws of matter is that the forms which ethics assume with evolution are very often the very contrary of the preceding forms and can by no stretch of imagination be considered as developments of the earlier forms. The same observation applies to æsthetics and every idea connected with life. They became more spiritual with the evolution of higher life.

We find a very remarkable characteristic of life as established by biology. The first characteristic of life is the dominant inclination and a limited degree of power of preserving the individual organization intact. Of this the living being is conscious and for it, it consciously strives. But over and above this, is the element in life, which dominates the master passion of self-preservation. It is the unconscious inclination to preserve the species. It is rightly said by biologists that "purposive effort to maintain the life of the species confronts us on every hand". Bergson gives several striking illustrations. "When the horsefly lays its eggs on the legs or the shoulders of the horse, it acts as if it knew that its larva has to develop in the horse's stomach and that the horse in licking itself will convey the larva into its digestive tract. When a paralysing wasp stings its victim on just those points where the nervous centres lie, so as to render it motionless killing it, it acts like a learned

entomologist and a skilful surgeon rolled into one" He then describes the wonderful process by which the Sitaris secures reproduction. Mc Dougall also describes the action of the wasp which drags its victim painfully to its previously prepared nest which it seals up together with her egg that it may serve as food to the offspring she will never see. The marvellous intelligence and prescience which characterize the instinct of these low forms of life can not be explained and baffles all materialistic theories about instinct. We also find that, in certain annuals in the vegetable world, the parent tree dies after reproduction. In the animal world, the mother sacrifices herself, if forced to do so, to preserve her offspring. Thus the living organism is dominated unconsciously by a desire to maintain the life of the species and displays supernatural intelligence and prescience in its "purposive effort" and even sacrifices itself for the purpose*. This fact is absolutely incompatible with an entirely material constitution of life and non-existence of a guiding Intelligence.

We go further and find that even dominating the inclination to preserve the species, is the inclination to bring about higher life. This instinct, like conscious reasoning, becomes very manifest in man, who, however degraded he may be, is conscious that that is the purpose of his life. This is the origin of the obligation felt by us, called duty. Kant described conscience not as our own inner voice but as the

* Professor Thomson rightly says "As in plants, the species-maintaining functions preponderate over the individual ones, so that from annual to agave, the plant must flower although it die, so the same preponderance appears in animals." Evolution p. 245 *

voice of the race. This applies to the imperative inclination to preserve the race and may apply to the inclination to improve it. But in reality ethics is the imperative inclination to transcend, one's own individuality and one's own race and to bring about a higher life, not only at the expense of the individual life but also at the expense of one's own race and species. It is the imperative law by which life strives to free itself from the fetters of matter and to attain the more spiritual itself and also to evolve the higher and more spiritual form of life in the universe.

Thus ethics originated in the dominating impulse in life to preserve the species and to bring about a higher species. In the lower forms, this impulse is merely instinctive. It has been considered a quality arising out of material combinations by materialistic scientists and as the result of an "original impetus" by the followers of Bergson. Both theories are untenable, as we have seen before and as will be apparent from a fuller consideration. It is clear that this instinct or impulse appears to be all but unconscious at the beginning. This characteristic is so deeply ingrained in life, that morality, which is its direct consequence, has seemed to the greatest of philosophers to be unconditionally obligatory, which is only another way of saying that it is instinctive. But biologists tell us that from the very beginning the actions of the living organism are characterized by purposive effort, which is very slight in the rudimentary state but which becomes fuller and more manifest with the evolution of higher life. Slowly, ethics assumes its

real character, the very essence of which is freedom of action, as Kant rightly says. The characteristic of life, which at the beginning was all but material or an impetus, over which it had no control, assumes the forms of intelligent determination of what is good and of choice, out of free volition. Darwin and his followers rightly assert that life "is the fountain of change; it is aggressive, insurgent, even riotous, in its multiplication; it struggles, it even chooses"* rightly and very often wrongly. Out of this riotousness and struggling and continual wrong choosings, life adopts a course that leads it to goodness and higher goodness. The result is so wonderful and the forms of goodness evolved so opposed to those they supplant and so unforeseeable that they can not be ascribed to matter or blind "impetus" or solely to "purposive effort" of the living being and can not be explained without the influence of a higher Being.

It should be observed that ethics in reality appertains to the individual. It is clear, without the individual, there can be no truth, no honesty, no chastity, no goodness and no altruism. The evolution of ethics accompanies the evolution of individuality. But moral philosophers have rightly pointed out that individuality and freedom are opposed to the restraints of morality. How then do these two contradictory elements grow together? The co-ordinating of opposing tendencies is a characteristic of life. Can it be explained without some control from

*Geddes and Thomson's *Evolution* p. 192.

outside? There is also the ethical tendency in a race and in a species to better itself and also to sacrifice itself for the evolution of the better race and the higher species. It may be attempted to be explained as a tendency arising out of the ethical tendencies of all the members of a race or species. But we have found no individual intelligence and action or aggregate of individual intelligence and action can explain the marvellous instinct in life by which the individual preserves the species and by which the species produces the higher species at the expense of itself. All explanation of the phenomenon except by reference to an Influence outside life is futile.

Evolution of
love.

Wonderful as is the phenomenon of the evolution of ethics, which is mainly passive, it is still more marvellous how the active qualities of mercy and love are evolved out of the same blind impulses, simultaneously with the evolution of greater individuality. Biologists say that, as life progresses, we find not only a gradual increase of intelligent behaviour but that "it becomes richer and freer" and there is "increased individuation" and "increase in parental care, and "there is an emergence of finer feelings and fondness is sublimed in love"* This statement very imperfectly expresses the sublimest fact in nature and life, which shows the loving relation between God and the living being and the necessity of religion, truly understood. Nature is unethical and merciless, as Huxley has shown. At the beginning of life, it is deceitful, dishonest, unchaste and merciless. It does not

*Evolution by Geddes and Thomson p. 97.

hesitate to destroy and devour the weak and actually revels in cruelty. Nature destroys the weak and the unfit ruthlessly by what is called the law of survival of the fittest. Nevertheless, from the very beginning we observe certain marvellous facts. The child on coming out of the womb cries and stretches forth its hands for the teats of the mother's breast ; simultaneously that which was dry before overflows with the sweet milk which preserves life. It is trifling to explain the fact away by ascribing it to material combinations and habit of numberless past generations of ancestors and to deny that there is a tinge of spiritual love in it. Next, we find that the mother animal is wholly dominated by the desire to preserve its young and fights to the last to do so and, it has been found, often deliberately sacrifices herself so that her offspring may be safe. This impulse is so strong that it may be called blind instinct. But without doubt there is an element of conscious love in it, which becomes manifest as life becomes higher. Wonderful it is to find that this parental care comes into existence and ends with the helpless condition of the young at the beginning. So the abounding love displayed is not wholly the love of the mother, for then it will not dry up as soon as the young one is able to take care of itself, but is mainly the result of a Love which preserves all life and leads it to higher life. Materialists attempt to show that it flows from ancient habit and hereditary instinct. The attempt is absolutely futile, for no habit and no instinct can be so strong as to override the instinct of self-preservation and to lead to self

sacrifice. The influx of Love is truer than the "impetus of life" of Bergson, which satisfies many minds. It becomes weaker and all but ceases when it is not required. With higher animals, like man, the period of tutelage is longer and love lasts longer, and we find that as life grows, the faculty of love outgrows the condition of helplessness to meet the exigencies of which it was necessary at the beginning. The living being has the rudiments of love in the beginning. This rudimentary love grows and becomes fuller and higher, taking in the water of the stream of abounding spiritual Love, which is always flowing into it.

Evolution
of mercy.

Similarly, cruelty is an essential attribute of rudimentary life. It preserves it. But slowly mercy is evolved. The impulse, found by biologists in life, to preserve the species at the expense of the individual, and in the lower species to evolve the higher at the expense of itself, is the result of a mysterious influx of mercy. This impulse is however often opposed to any consideration for and mercy towards the individual and especially towards the unfit individual. But with the evolution of higher life, greater regard due to the fuller individuality dominates life, and the influx of mercy, which preserves the species, attaches to every individual of it and makes it compassionate towards its weaker brother, whose higher individuality was brought about by the sacrifice of millions of living beings of lower species, with less developed individuality, and who thus became worthier of preservation. The being with the higher

individuality is certainly worthier of preservation than one with less developed individuality. Nature destroys the unfit. Slowly with the growth of life, and individuality, mercy towards the weak, the helpless and the unfit becomes one of the dominant characteristics of living beings. Mercy was at the root of life. But the deep and powerful mercy, which preserves the species and evolves the higher species, is too high and altruistic for the low organism, which indeed is not only absolutely unconscious of it in any form but is dominated by its contrary cruelty. But it had the 'pigment grain' and under the influence of the everflowing stream of mercy proceeding from the feet of the Father, beautiful and lovable beyond conception, it gradually becomes contrary of what it originally was, and just as the blind evolve sight, so the cruel become merciful and altruistic. Some philosophers assert that "light acted directly on organized matter so as to change its structure and somehow adapted its structure to its own form."* The statement has only a modicum truth in it. But in the kingdom of the spirit, it is absolutely true that the influx of the stream of the spiritual acting on all but material life gradually changes it to its own form. This marvellous action is the basis of religion.

We have seen above that that which has no individuality can excite no mercy or love and that one with greater individuality excites greater mercy and love. Further unconscious matter or nature can feel no

*Bergson Creative Evolution p. 73.

Love of and
towards God.

mercy or love. Life in its rudimentary stage is practically indistinguishable from matter and manifests little mercy and is not the object of much mercy or love. An insect excites less mercy and love and feels less mercy and love than man. Mercy and love thus have graduations and follow individuality in its upward course. The higher the individual, the greater and purer love he has and further excites purer and greater mercy and love. Marvellous though it may seem, the inference from the facts mentioned above can not be avoided that the greatest and purest mercy and love are felt by the Being with the highest or absolute individuality, and further, He excites and is the object of the greatest love. Mystic lovers of God assert that it is so. We need not rely upon their strange experiences, which are often unhealthy and unnatural. But the inference from facts of life can not be ignored. The basic elements of life are hidden deep below the surface-consciousness and it is possible that in our inmost consciousness we are dimly aware of the touch of the loving hand of the all-merciful One and as dimly feel that he is the One towards whom we have the greatest love.

We have come to the position that the universe of life is becoming better, greater, higher and more spiritual. As regards the universe of matter, there may be combination and ephemeral changes but, in its essence and reality, it remains the same. This is the great distinction, the sharp dividing line between dead matter and life, which by a mysterious process is evolved either out of matter or in indispensable

commerce with it. If life were a product of matter, there will be practically no change for the better and the totality of the universe will remain the same, the organism when dead disintegrating into its component molecules. Is there therefore a world of spirits, as distinguished from a world of matter? It is difficult to say that there are two different elements in this universe, life and matter. It is also difficult to say that there is a supreme spiritual being, apart and distinct from the universe of life and dead matter. Thus philosophers for the sake of scientific consistency are obliged to hold that there is nothing but matter or nothing but God, both positions being, in essence the same. Others, reluctant to give up the idea of individual spiritual essence or essences, consider that spirit and life and matter constitute the phenomenal universe and this universe with some spiritual essence, called God, constitutes an organic whole on the model of a living body. This does not remove the difficulty of the supposition of an entity quite distinct from matter nor of the supposition of an entity outside the phenomenal world, unless you consider that the living principle is material, as materialistic biologists assert. The most consistent theory is without doubt materialism or its plausible and pleasant variation, pantheism. But both are wholly incompatible with the fact of the evolution of higher and more spiritual life and must be rejected, notwithstanding their logic and scientific consistency, for they are clearly false, being opposed to facts.

How can we also reasonably conceive of a God outside the phenomenal universe, who created it

millions of years ago with the potentiality of progress and whose only business is to regulate it like a clock-maker? Only in the world of matter do we find the unerring regular chain of effects from causes, which materialists, who believe in nature with her fixed laws, and pantheists and believers in perfect unerring unalterable predispositions of a Lord of the universe would ask us to accept. But in the realms of life, we find, as science tells us, not only habits formed and customs fixed which constitute "at any stage the routine, the general trend of things" but also "spontaneity and growth, new decisions to be taken, fresh experiments to be made with their usual sequel of trial and error and possible eventual success." This experiment and failure and new decision and possible eventual success is an undeniable fact in life. It is not consistent with everything being dead matter regulated by immutable laws or with a perfect God who regulated and did every thing and who in his perfect prescience and wisdom must have predetermined everything. It is only consistent with the existence of independent imperfect life-entities, thinking, deciding and willing, as apart from dead matter, which cannot make decisions. But the orderliness of nature and her laws and the fact of the evolution of higher life cannot be explained by the strivings of these tiny living entities, as Ward supposes. Nature is dead and can have no part in it. Further, life-entities are at their origin indistinguishable from matter and it is not conceivable that they can of their own effort evolve the highest spiritual life. If that were so,

each of them would be a potential God and if it depended wholly on their efforts to evolve the highest life, it is clear that they would be the most perfect gods at once. It is apparent that the progress of life is limited and regulated by something real outside the living beings. We find as a fact that the evolution of higher life is the result of the efforts of the living being and of the action of some outside Influence which is not that of dead matter which can have no power of determination.

The marvellous intelligence manifested in the formation of the structure of the lower organisms cannot be the intelligence of those organisms. Nor is it the result of tiny atoms endowed with an infinitesimal degree of intelligence. Bergson therefore supposed the result to proceed from "an original impetus" of a flowing stream of vitality, which is another way of describing an influx of intelligence from outside. The fact is matter or something very like matter is evolving reason, individuality, ethics, mercy and love, in an ever-increasing degree, and they are becoming more and more spiritual. The fact that individuality becomes greater and keener is wholly inconsistent with pantheism and the like, which suppose that the goal of life is to coalesce with the inactive impersonal God. It is also inconsistent with the theory of the stream of life. Nor can the result be due wholly to an influx from outside. We find conscious effort, conscious reasoning, free volition and individuality evolving in a greater and greater measure. A God, that has determined every thing

beforehand and left nothing to the free determination and effort of his creatures, is not consistent with the facts of life found by biology. The influence from outside which we find is an influence which converts matter into spiritual forms. As some philosophers and scientists say matter, like the sun's rays, by constant action upon other matter can reduce it to its own form, similarly the influence we contemplate may make all-but-material life gradually assume a spiritual form. But we here find that the living form also makes the most strenuous effort for the realization of the same result. This relationship of the living being and that ineffable Influence is the mystery of mysteries, which one should not be rash enough to attempt to solve with his present imperfect understanding.

The living being is always creating, rightly says Bergson. God also is always creating. They are co-workers, who produce the marvellous results we find. Ideas are said to materialize. "The creative power of thought is the law of the spiritual world," asserted Swedenborg. The position of science that mind and matter are related supposes that mind is not material, and its relatedness to matter can only refer to its power over it and thus it corroborates to some extent the position of the mystic philosopher. This power of creation is the great mystery which remains unsolved. Materialism, pantheism, panpsychism and other speculations have not solved it. Louis Agassiz in his great book, *Essay on Classification*, says that each species of animal or plant is an "incarnate thought of the Creator."

Materialistic biologists laugh at the idea. They assert that thought is a material product of the action of the brain-cells having kinetic energy which can produce material results. According to them also therefore, this wonderfully regulated universe is a creation of thought considered as a product of matter. Their doctrine seems as fantastic to the pure idealists, as that of the idealists seems to them. To the methods of empirical science both are foreign and untenable, for an idea wholly immaterial is unknown to it, and also pure ideas and thought can not be recognized as parts of the physical world by it. But the materialistic biologist, who denies God, says that the atoms have the property of thought and their combination produces the great laws which give regularity to this wonderful universe and thus bring it into existence, though it does not create it. This materialistic idea of thought in atoms producing the universe of matter and life is in reality indistinguishable from the idea of Agassiz that the universe is thought incarnate of God. It is difficult otherwise to explain the phenomena of life and the regularity of the material universe with its immutable laws and infinite diversity. There can be no idea of a point, a line, a surface, a straight line, parallel lines, a line extended to infinity and the like, if ideas are material, for there is no material body without three dimensions according to experience, which is the only source of knowledge and guide to truth according to both Kant and Haeckel.* The whole of physical science

*Kant says in his *Prolegomena* to any future metaphysics that can be regulated as science (1783): "A knowledge of things by pure reason or intelligence is nothing but an empty appearance; only in experience is there truth".

mathematics and the fine arts however, deal only with these ideal entities and forms. They are real, though it is true that they arise from the experience of material limited things of three dimensions. Material entities therefore spiritualize into ideas, for the ideas can not but be considered as arising out of the experience of the material. Scientists again have analysed matter to forms so subtle as to be very near ideas. But still the question remains unsolved whether thought and idea can materialize. Ideas when they assume forms derived from matter may be said to materialize but can they still further materialize. The idealistic philosophers of the West and the East assert that they can. Bergson finds that life is always creating. Hindus and Buddhists assert the reality of the power of desire in life to create matter, and that the senses and the objects of senses are invariable and unconditional concomitants of ideas. The marvellous power of life over matter is admitted by Lord Kelvin. Bergson goes further and says that "the visible outlines of bodies are the design of our eventual action on them." *Modern philosophers and scientists have thus very nearly adopted the Hindu doctrine. The relation of matter to mind is the object of the highest investigations of science and we shall know more of it in course of time.

Bergson has demonstrated that the machine theory of the materialists and the finalist theory of the ancient theistic philosophers are in reality identical and are

* Creative Evolution, p. 102.

both untenable. Thus God he will not admit, as he knows only of God as taught in the universities of Europe, which were devoted to show, as Huxley said "how and why what the Church said was true and must be true." The true God is however not the dead God of the revealed books, who created for six days and has since then been quiescent. The true God is always creating. A famous devotional writer of Bengal imagined God to be an artist who is always engaged in painting newer and more beautiful pictures, which materialize in the universe.* That is a profound idea. This orderly marvellous universe of matter with innumerable suns and planets, evolved from chaotic matter is a creation and a work of the highest art. The splendour and the beauty that will be evolved in future is beyond our imagination. In the world of life however, the fact becomes clearer still and as we have seen before, every form and idea connected with life, that are evolved in its progress are quite distinct from any thing that existed before. The evolution of higher forms of life is clear creation.

But if the position that the living being can create is accepted without any limit we land in chaos. The innumerable living beings, who have ideas, if their ideas always materialize or if they be always creating, as Bergson says, and if their undoubted power over matter be unlimited, there cannot but be such a clash and confusion that it will be worse than the

*Sisir Kumar Ghose thus describes God in his book, the Kala Chand Gita.

chaos produced by two suns when they collide and break into pieces or when the universe is destroyed on the Last Day. Therefore we must suppose that in the case of the being with perfect intelligence and art and ethics and love and absolute individuality alone can thought and idea materialize without any limitation. In the case of other living beings, the power of creation and materialization of ideas is limited and imperfect and grows like all their other powers. Limited freedom, limited volition and limited power of creation and effort, lead to higher life and higher spiritual powers not solely however, of themselves but in co-operation with an ineffable Power. The facts of life lead to no other conclusion. All other hypotheses are untenable. Why it is so, it is futile to speculate at present. We shall know more as life progresses. It will be shown in a subsequent chapter how the idea of God is growing, and it has already been shown in the last chapter that all that we can say is that He is becoming more and more knowable with the progress of life.

The materialistic conception of the universe is of two descriptions. The first is that all is matter and this universe of suns and planets and of life of various kinds is evolved by action and re-action of atoms governed by immutable laws. The second is that the result is produced by dead atoms and living atoms endowed with intelligence, which evolve the glorious forms of life we see. The pure idealist considers that there is only one spirit substance out of which matter and life are evolved and to which

they ultimately return. The believers in God as described in revealed religions and by philosophers, who support them, consider that this universe was created by a God according to predetermined design and that He sometimes varies His law by miracles out of love towards His creatures.

All these ideas are opposed to modern science and philosophy. Science has found as a fact that the universe of dead unintelligent unethical matter and energy, a welter of molecules in dark and dismal infinite space, governed by laws which are immutable, is still subject to a marvellous intelligence and purpose. Suns and planets, the orderly systems in the heavens, the wonderful universe we see, have been evolved out of chaos. There is "continuity and consistency in it all; there is beauty in it and design in it." What do we further see? We see that out of all this dead matter, like the lotus springing out of mud, life slowly manifests itself and assumes forms glorious beyond words.

The old religions say this world of life is wholly subject to a God who is almighty, at whose command the manifestations occur and cease, and life ultimately coalesces with His essence or becomes capable of enjoying all human pleasures without stint and of avoiding all pains. The idea is God is all in all. The world of life is an automaton or a cinematograph, the films of which are continuously being unrolled and exhibited by God to himself, for there is no other person in reality to enjoy them. God according to the most approved religious philosophy is impersonal. A God willing,

loving and acting is not high enough. Another doctrine is that God is love, which to most people means that God loves his creatures, just as a child loves its doll, whom it clothes and feeds and fondles. As a return for all His goodness to men, it was supposed, He required sacrifices of burnt offerings of animals and butter, and temples with incense, candles, flowers, song and dance and music. Some consider fasting and penance, bathings and pilgrimages please Him. Some give the symbols, they worship, food and raiment, bedding and warm covering and treat them with the love, they bear to their own children. With others love to God takes the form of hymns and praise and thanksgiving, and mystic ceremonies, which they consider greatly please Him. All these do lead to true love of God, the rudiments of which are in the constitution of all living beings. By all religious men, the highest form of this love is considered to be to give willing submission to the will of God and to continuously pray that His will be done. This resignation to the will of God is a noble doctrine having great spiritual significance and efficacy. Indeed, it is difficult to conceive how there can be a nobler doctrine, and how there can be more than one will and one purpose in this universe consistent with the greatness of God. The feeling of the grandeur of the idea we have inherited from our ancestors and all religious and profane literature and philosophy are full of it. Scientific men also indulge in magnificent poetic language in expressing this idea.

But biology has torn to shreds our old convictions. It has shown that there are only two possible hypotheses: one the wholly materialistic theory of life and the universe; and the other that of the evolution of the spiritual, in which freedom of will and conscious individual effort are indispensable. Biology proves conclusively the fact of the ever-growing power of free volition and effort and ever-growing individuation in life. But the influence of an ineffable Entity of absolute individuality is necessary. There is therefore no other alternative but to conclude that the effort of an organism with imperfect individuality and imperfect power of free volition, in co-operation with the influence of One with absolute individuality and perfect freedom of will and power over matter, brings about the wonderful phenomena, we find around us and in us. Why should it be so? How is it compatible with a being of perfect individuality, wisdom and power? How and why we do not know, but it is so. All morality connotes freedom. Without free volition there can be the attachment of the slave but no love. All love between the living being and God is possible only when there is freedom on both sides and co-operation with one another. But why should God have cared for the love of His creatures? We do not know. But our inmost heart is conscious of His love. We form our ideas of the spirit from those of matter and can not but make mistakes. By supposing that God evolves higher and newer, unforeseeable forms of life, of beauty and harmony, of wisdom and goodness, of mercy and love, in co-operation with us, who are

among the tiniest and meanest of His creatures, we probably do not derogate from His greatness. In any case, the idea is truer and nobler than the idea of a dead quiescent impersonal creator. We however know but little and in whatever terms we may describe God, we perhaps only bhaspheme. The author of the Mahabharata, who was also the author of the Vedanta, therefore concluded a noble hymn by a prayer to God for forgiveness of the great sin of presuming to attempt to describe Him. The Father however bears with the imperfections of his children and knows that they can not help searching after Him and probably delights in their effort and in any manifestation of their willing and disinterested love towards Him.

Most philosophers have found the existence of God incompatible with the existence of pain and evil. Buddha sought Nirvana and denied God, because of the invariable concomitance of pain and evil and sorrow with life. The question should therefore be considered next.

CHAPTER V.

THE MYSTERY OF PAIN.

In all religions, one of the greatest and most difficult unsolved problems is that of pain. We hear the piercing cry of pain from the universe of life and our hearts grow faint. Why is the cry perennially arising from this world of suffering beings, "O Father where art thou? Where is the Sacred Heart that comforts them? It is not to be wondered at that many noble merciful minds become unbelievers when they find this agonized cry of life unanswered. This great question should therefore be considered from a positive point of view and not evaded or answered with hopes of another world and with arguments as mysterious as the question itself, which positive philosophy can not recognize.

God, the merciful Lord of life, has been denied because of the existence of pain and evil. Even the most optimistic theistic philosophers get rid of the fact by assuming that all is God, and pain and evil are mere illusions. Haeckel truly says that Brahmanism and Buddhism are pessimistic and atheistic, as they deny a personal God and they so deny in order to avoid the logical inference arising from the reality of pain. Schopenhauer, a great admirer and follower of the Hindu Upanishads, says that it is "a glaring absurdity to attempt to prove this miserable world the best of all possible ones—this cockpit of tortured and suffering beings, who

can only survive by destroying each other, in which the capacity for pain grows with knowledge and so reaches its height in man. Truly optimism cuts so sorry a figure in this theatre of sin, suffering and death that we should have to regard it as a piece of sarcasm, if Hume had not given as an explanation of its origin (the wish to flatter God and hope for some result from it). To the palpable sophistry of Leibnitz, who would prove this world the best of all possible, we can oppose a strict and honest proof that it is the worst of all possible." Speaking of death Haeckel says: "We are asked to console ourselves in face of this tragedy with the hollow phrases: 'God's will be done or God's ways are wonderful: Simple children and dull believers may soothe themselves with such phrases. They no longer impose upon men in the twentieth century, who prefer a full and fearless knowledge of the truth". The conclusion, to which the great biologist arrives at, is reason can not detect the shadow of proof of the existence and action of conscious providence or "loving father in heaven." Schopenhauer and Hume, Huxley and Haeckel and all the twentieth century philosophers, pantheists, monists and pluralists, biologists and materialists have however only followed Buddha but have not gone as far as he in his denial of God. Because of pain he not only denied God but taught further that the worship of God led to sorrow; he denied not only a personal God but also the Brahman, the central Monad of Leibnitz who binds together all the infinite number of monads, the individual living beings, which Haeck-

kel claims as corresponding to his psychic atoms, in substantial unity, who it is said, created "the best of all possible worlds" and whose infinite goodness, wisdom and power pervades the universe. Personal or impersonal or immanent or the All, how is the existence of pain consistent with a merciful God or a merciful Reason that dominates this universe? The Mimamsists of ancient India held that the ideas of God and pain are inconsistent with one another and can not exist together, and as there is pain, logically there can be no God. The followers of the Nyaya philosophy vainly attempted to refute the position by asserting that God was not the cause of the universe and of life with its pain, in which case alone the position of the Mimamsists would be correct, but that He was merely like space in which the world and life existed and without which they could not exist. There is not much difference between space-like God and no-God. The Vedantists asserted that pain was an illusion. Buddha brushed aside the cobwebs of sophistry of metaphysicians, who from his time till now hold the accepted idea of pain, and denied God altogether and in his great sympathy for the infinite sum of misery and pain in the universe of life sought Nirvana.

Whether
God and
pain can ex-
ist together.

Philosophers and religious men have also attempted to abolish pain by various devices, asceticism, yoga, desirelessness and religious exercises.

Futile at-
tempts of reli-
gious men.

Again philosophers have attempted to show that pleasure and pain exist only as relative to one another and have no absolute real existence. Paley makes some very acute and true observations in this

Are pain
and pleasure
only relative?

connection. He says: "Neither does happiness consist in an exemption from pain, labour, care, business, suspense, molestation and 'those evils which are without'; such a state being usually attended not with ease but with depression of spirits, a tastelessness in all our ideas, imaginary anxieties and the whole train of hypochondriacal affections." He then tries to prove that happiness is "only a relative term." This idea of relativity has arisen from the fact that pleasure and pain invariably follow one another. But that is because of the natural material law that every action is followed by reaction and also because there are such things as fatigue, rest and recuperation in the physical world. A cessation of pain is pleasurable as it often leads to rest and recuperation, and even a moderate amount of pain, as Paley rightly says, often leads to pleasure. Similarly pleasures after enjoyment seem stale and the incapacity for enjoying pleasures for ever, attendant on the physical constitution of life, is considered a great pain. Socrates ridiculed the prevailing ideas of pain and pleasure by saying truly that the keenest of pleasures is derived from scratching itches.

Position of
Plato.

Of all the philosophers, Socrates and Plato seem to have most thoroughly analysed the nature of pleasure and pain. Socrates says pleasure is a reality and is not mere absence of pain and that it has degrees and is found mixed with pain and is often "a mixed evil" and "that some pleasures seem to be but are by no means so in reality; and that some appear to be many and great but are mixed up

with pains touching the difficulties of the body and the soul" and that "for the greatest pleasure "one must not go and look upon the healthy but upon the sick."* He also says with great truth that pain also has degrees and there is no absolute limitless pain, in which theologians delight, and that pain is found mixed with pleasure. The whole trend of their philosophy seems to be to show that pain and pleasure can be made light of by the of philosophic mind.

Ascetics say that pain can be conquered by contemplation and ascetism. Yogees in India can hibernate like frogs in winter. From that, it is argued that the human mind can be brought into a condition in which neither pleasure nor pain can affect it. But we are concerned with living throbbing beings and with a condition of active life, and not hibernation or death. Buddha was opposed to the hibernation of the ordinary Yogee and preached that by intense meditation, the eternal pain may be conquered in Nirvana. But even he, the master, the greatest of all Yogees, who, it is recorded, while immersed in thought while walking, was dead to all outward world deaf to the rumbling noise of a hundred carts, of the crack of thunder or of the torrential rain of India, even he, felt excruciating pain in the stomach on his death-bed. Indeed he up to the last moment of his life asserted the absolute truth of the cardinal rule that life is invariably accompanied with pain. So let not ascetics try to

Attempts to
abolish pain
by ascetism
and contem-
plation.

*Burgess' Translation of Plato Vol. IV. pp. 69, 70, 79.

delude men by saying that pain can be avoided' by a life of purity, benevolence, contemplation and devotion.

Vedantic view of pain. The view of the Vedantist that pain is an illusion is therefore the only possible hypothesis for explaining it away, which is not inconsistent with the facts of life.

Unfortunately all these philosophic speculations have not abolished pain. Pain is not something foreign introduced into life by God or by the living beings themselves. It is neither accidental nor an effect of a cause foreign to life, nor an illusion or a negative conception. It is a positive fact, an inevitable companion to life, which no living being can shake off.

Materialistic ideas of pain. The view of the pure materialist, which is in its essence indistinguishable from that of the illusionist philosopher, is that cries and tears and writhings of the body are only physiological facts, of which pain and sorrow are merely material effects, having no spiritual meaning to a living being having self-consciousness considered as arising from physical or material energy or property of an undefined description. In the view of the philosophers that pain is an illusion we should laugh at it. In the view of the materialist also, we need not trouble ourselves much with it. It is only because, it affects the palpitating individual living being, as apart from the nerves and brain matter, that it is worth considering. To materialists and atheistic biologists, it has no greater significance than an atmospheric disturbance

or any stimulation of the nerves from alcohol or ether or like substances; and their complaints, "why do we suffer", why are we "the playthings of the gods" or "the sport of inhuman forces which are beyond our control," are absolutely meaningless.

Ordinary people try to satisfy their doubting hearts by the hypothesis that there is more pleasure than pain. Philosophers seem to be agreed that if there be more pain than pleasure in life, there can be no God, and they are divided into two great classes, namely those that believe in the preponderance of pain and those that believe in the preponderance of pleasure. Pessimists, Vedantists, pantheists, Buddhists and atheists are in the first category. In the second category are the optimists and the dualistic philosophers like the Vaishnavas of India. Modern science has however solved the problem, and another of our pleasant delusions has been destroyed. Professor Waller, an eminent psychologist has recently demonstrated by well authenticated experiments about electrical response to nervous excitement that pain or the anticipation of pain has far more effect on the nervous system than pleasure and thus affects the living being more. Thus in life pain is greater than pleasure.

Many biologists and philosophers assert that "the emotions originated in physical movements which serve a physiological purpose." Darwin in his *Expressions of the Emotions* "has shown the physiological purpose of emotional expressions. The scowl which is expressive of anger is the vestige of the setting of

the brow assumed by an animal before charging a hostile animal. The sneer which exhibits the canine teeth is all that remains of the fierce threat of the wolf to devour". Indeed, James in his *Psychology* says : "We feel sorry because we cry, angry because we strike, afraid because we tremble". There is some truth in the statement. The animal struck another for food, not out of anger. But it is not correct to say that the animal acquired the emotion of anger from the habit of striking for food. When it ate up an unresisting carcase the expression of emotion of anger did not appear. It is resistance or possible resistance, the trouble and the possibility of danger and fight, which gave birth to that emotion. We are therefore angry because we have to strike for physiological causes and meet with resistance and fight from the animal attacked, which give us trouble and pain, and we are in consequence disturbed in mind. Similarly, the first act of crying is the cry for the mother's milk. That wonderful cry is consequent on craving for sustenance for the body and is the result of the marvellous expectation, inherent in life, of the cry being heard. A solitary individual in a desert, who is hopeless of succour, would not cry. The cry is the cry for succour. Originally it was indistinguishable from a physical movement. But that movement was caused by a certain disturbance in the living organism necessitated by self-preservation.

Children cry very often without pain for small things and so do grown-up men and women. Hysterical persons feel pains because of the

hysterical cries. Thus it may be said that "we feel sorry because we cry". But the statement, though true of hysterical persons and of little children or overgrown children, is not true in all cases. The animal certainly is sensible of some discomfort for want of food. The nervous condition brought about gives forth to cries and tears. But the original disturbance has its origin in external causes. The disturbance and the uncomfortable sensation are practically indistinguishable from physical movements in rudimentary forms of life. As life grows into finer forms, they become keener and keener and the disagreeable sensation manifests the spiritual element evolved in the progress of life in consciousness and is recognized as pain. Similarly, with the growth of life, physical movements consequent on satisfaction of the bodily cravings evolve the spiritual element and are recognized as pleasures. Pains and pleasures accompany life for its preservation and progress and are certainly good if life is good and better than non-life in which there is neither pain nor pleasure

Pain, as well as pleasure, is a reality, a positive fact of conscious life, which the verbal explanations and speculations of philosophers and scientists can not abolish. But there is a natural law according to which pleasure and pain are always found to co-exist. Without pain therefore, pleasure cannot be found in nature. Thus if it pleased the All Merciful One to abolish pain, pleasure would go with it. Life, Buddha has abundantly shown, is by the very law of its existence invariably accompanied with pain. With pain therefore, life also must dis-

appear. That is the position which should be clearly understood.

The question arises, why should we have pain at all? Only to get rid of it and thus to extinguish the fire of existence, says Buddha. There would be no pleasure and no life, if pain could be got rid of. The wisest of all teachers. Buddha, out of his great compassion for suffering living beings, taught his philosophy and his way to Nirvana. Here again, positive philosophy would not recognize his method of blowing out the flame of life. It has to deal with life and its laws, of which, the inevitable co-existence of pain is one. The whole question resolves therefore into 'is life good and desireable—so good and desirable that the excruciating pains, which we suffer ought to be borne for it?' All living beings feel that it is so and are reluctant to part of with life notwithstanding its many and great miseries. Even then the mystery is not solved. Pain is pain and the suffering world is crying in pain. "Oh, it is burning and and burning" says Buddha. Where art Thou O Lord? is the cry that is continually going up to heaven. It is apparently unanswered. Is it really unanswered?

The question is simple. Lifeless matter has no pain. Is life with its many pains better than the eternal quiet and rest of dead matter? Is this glorious sentient conscious world of life, with its heart-rending cry of pain, worse than the dark, blind, deaf, unfeeling, thoughtless, unconscious totality of dead matter, tumbling on in the eternal heavens? The

cry of pain is the cry caused by the process, which evolves life out of matter, senses out of insensible material organisms and higher life out of lower life.

There is great truth in the definitions of pleasure and pain by modern scientists, who say that "pleasures are the correlatives of actions which conduce to the welfare of the organism and pains are the correlatives of actions injurious to the organism." Pleasures and pains have however a spiritual meaning as they are recognized as pleasures and pains by the rejoicing or suffering individual alone, and not by the species, or by Nature. They are felt by the individual only by its power of discrimination; they exist only in relation to the feeling conscious individual. Let us however consider the biological facts about pain more fully.

Huxley defines pain as the result of an excessive stimulation of any of the nerve-endings, which are concerned in giving rise to sensations," and says that "it also results from stimulating the trunks of the nerves leading from these endings to the central nervous system"*

Without sensations, life and consciousness are meaningless. Thus pain is a disturbance, in the beginning all-but-wholly physical—which causes sensation and life and which later leads to effort, motion and action. The laws of evolution no doubt reach us that nature is red with tooth and claw and from that fact some scientists infer there

*Elements of physiology p 254.

is no sign of a merciful Lord in it. But those very laws teach us that the evolution of life from non-life is the result of disturbances and cruel wrenches, like the effect of the stroke of the hammer on red hot iron, of the violent disintegration of atoms and still more elementary material substances by the excessive heat of burning planets and suns, which brings into existences substances out of which the peculiarly constituted entities called living organisms are formed, as some scientists tell us. The sensation which produces a semblance of life to all-but-non-living organization, must be the rudimentary pain caused by the disturbance and disintegration of its constitution, which cause the uncomfortable sensation which is pain, according to scientists. It is pain that gives life to non-life. Non-life is blind, immobile, unfeeling matter, without any freedom. Life is freedom : its first sensation is the desire to escape and be free from disturbances and the unending pain of the disintegration of the organism, which is necessary for its manifestation in every stage of its evolution. Progress means greater freedom and that is attained only through pain. Pain, progress, freedom and happiness are thus co-existent and correlated facts of life.

The process of the evolution of the sense-organs is thus indicated by Herbert Spencer in his Synthetic Philosophy, in reference to the eye: "In some kinds of pigment provided in animal tissue, light produces marked molecular changes. As the rudimentary eye consists of a few pigment grains, it may be inferred that rudimentary vision is constituted by the

“wave of disturbance which a sudden change in the states of these pigment grains propagates through the body.” The eye could not be evolved out of the spot on the head, if there was no disturbance, no poignant pain and if there was no painful effort. The same process has evolved the ear, the nose and the other senses, and every thing that is good and desirable in life has been produced in consequence of pain.

Herbert Spencer further describes the process the evolution of the higher species thus: “On glancing up from low types of animals having but rudimentary eyes and small powers of motion, to high types of animals having wide vision, considerable intelligence and great activity, it becomes undeniable that where loss of life is entailed on the first by these defects, life is preserved in the last by these superiorities. The implication then is that successive improvements of the organs of sense and motion and of the internal co-ordinating apparatus, which uses them, have indirectly resulted from the antagonisms and competitions of organisms with one another.”* What the great philosopher misses is that antagonisms and competitions in themselves are of no effect. The pain, the fear, the hope, the keen desire and strenuous effort, which they lead to, are the direct causes of the evolution and development of the sense-organs and all the powers of life and the improvements in them and their growth. The fleetness of the deer is caused by the pain of being cruelly eaten up by the tiger. It is the keen pain to escape from death at

* *Principles of Sociology*. Vol. I p. 508.

being devoured by others that develops, if it does not produce, the senses in the all-but-lifeless organizations. Competition is also a potent cause of progress. Further, life is being continually dragged down to parasitism, torpor and materiality, as Bergson rightly says, and it maintains itself by strenuous effort and slowly but painfully frees itself from the fetters of matter and wins greater individuation and greater power over matter.

Morality
and mercy
result from
pain.

We find further that morality and mercy, love and self-sacrifice would not come into existence, except on account of pain. Mercy had its birth in the heart of suffering living being. Sympathy, mercy and love cannot be felt by the living being who never had any pain. Society would not exist without pain. The bitterness of pain is well-known. But there would be no sweetness in life, if there were no pain. The poet has truly said that "our sweetest songs are those that tell of saddest thought." There would be no philosophy but for pain. Indian philosophers rightly said that the object of philosophy was the destruction of pain and sorrow. All that is highest and best in life would not come into existence without pain.

Make your choice : eyes, ears and the other senses and mind, ethics and mercy on one side and painless existence without them on the other. Positive rational philosophy will make only one answer : let us have progressive life with pain. To philosophy, pain is infinitely good, for out of it glorious forms of life, intellect, freedom and spirituality have evolved and still more glorious forms are being evolved. The cry

of pain of life is surely answered in the process of evolution of species with a shower of unexpected and glorious blessings. Merciful nature answers the cry. But is mercy a component part of dead matter? Or does it proceed from God? However that may be, we know that the cry of pain of living beings is answered by a merciful Law.

Pain consequent on disturbances in the organism leads to effort without which life will cease. Pleasure is less necessary at the beginning than pain. Physiologists are therefore right when they say pain is greater than pleasure in life. By a great spiritual law there is an underlying basis of pleasure in every painful sensation and consequent effort. Every function of life is a source of pleasure. Life's happiness consists in toil and effort. The contrary of it is parasitism, pleasure, rest and reverting back to matter. A person, who revives after a death-like condition, feels supremely happy. This will give an idea of the pleasure and the happiness, which is at the base of life and which carries it forward. The constant disturbances consequent on material constitution and effort to overcome the tendency in nature to drag to death and matter which dogs life throughout its entire career, as pointed out by Bergson, are causes of pain. When the living being gives up the effort and degenerates to parasitism, its pain ceases. This is the mystery of pain.

There can be no pain felt by unconscious matter. Pain comes into existence with consciousness and like it, it has grades. Originally we have

only physical movements and disturbances in the organism, which have no meaning as pain. As consciousness grows, pain becomes manifest. It has greater and newer meaning with increased individuation. The pain of an insect is not the same as the pain of a beast and the pain of a beast is not the same as the pain of a man. The sound of music will carry meaning and give rise to feelings in man absolutely different to the impressions and sensations which it will convey to a beast, though the physical causes be identical. So far as pain is material, it is unchanged in form and its materiality is the only link of its identity in different grades of consciousness.

Pleasure
likewise has
grades.

The same observations apply to pleasure. It came into existence with life and consciousness and has been growing with them. It has grades for it accompanies consciousness. There is therefore no such thing as absolute pleasure or joy, the Ananda or Amrita of the philosophers, in progressive life.

Eternal hea-
ven of abso-
lute joy and
eternal hell of
pure pain op-
posed to facts
of life.

The idea of eternal absolute joy, which is the heaven of all religions, and the idea of eternal absolute unmixed pain, which is the hell of the Christians, are opposed to the facts of life. Positive science has demonstrated that consciousness and individuality and with them pleasure and pain are always progressive and are changing and assuming forms wholly new and unforeseeable, just as is the case with all ideas and feelings connected with life, described before.

With the evolution of greater consciousness and individuality pain becomes greater, and pleasure also

becomes greater. The more life frees itself from the fetters of matter it feels happier and the ratio in which pains are greater than pleasures becomes less and less. Pain becomes greater but the hidden basis of the pleasure of life comes more and more to the surface. There are few pains more intense than acute toothache. But before the exhilaration of youth, before the joy of life, it is after all a matter of joke. All pains of the body, which do not endanger life, are regarded lightly by man. The sentimental pains arising out of disappointed love or ambition and wounded vanity are taken more to heart. Only such pains, physical or sentimental, which benumb and lead to inaction and torpor—they are few in number—are injurious to life. The rest are necessary for rousing the living organism to effort and action and are thus indispensable to life. Pleasure and joy in reality mean the joy of effort, the joy of the fight, the joy of overcoming obstacles which cause pain, the joy of conquest, the joy of freedom, the joy of performing the functions of life, the joy of progress,—indeed they mean the joy of life of the poets.

Pleasure is a reality. It is of four kinds. The first is the sense of agreeableness that proceeds from rest in the process of recuperation after fatigue of the organism after disturbances material in the beginning; the second proceeds from the satisfaction of preserving its constitution from outside influences and from supporting it with food; the third proceeds from the satisfaction of reproduction and the preservation of the species; the fourth, which is the

highest of all, proceeds from the evolution of higher powers of life and of the higher species. These all fall under two main heads. One is pleasure arising from rest, which is wholly material, the other arises from conscious effort for self-preservation, reproduction and evolution of higher life. The first often leads to torpor and parasitism. The second leads to life and higher life. It is based on effort, and effort means labour and pain. Thus pleasure, which is not material and is spiritual, is based on pain. In the realm of the spirit, it is difficult to distinguish the two.

The great spiritual truth, that we find in life, as we have seen above, is that pleasure or joy is at the very root of life. Poets when they speak of the joy of life unconsciously express a great truth and describe a biological fact. Philosophers also speak of Amrita or eternal joy in life. The idea of absolute joy they speak of however, is not founded on fact. The sense of pleasure or joy grows with the growth of consciousness and individuality. There were only the rudiments of it at the beginning. Further, there was more pain than pleasure. The preponderance of pain over pleasure has continued even up to man, though the ratio has been diminishing fast. Thus though pleasure or joy was all but non-existent in rudimentary life, it is still a marvellous fact that life is based on a sense of pleasure latent in it, hidden deep down its heart. It follows as an unavoidable conclusion that pain, which makes life struggle and thus keep up its existence, must also be based in a mysterious way on pleasure or joy, as

pleasure is at the base of life and thus also at the base of pain, which is a constituent element of life. It is a mysterious spiritual fact. We have found that in the realm of the spirit contraries spring from each other, unlike all material phenomena. We know of the joy of life of poets, we all feel it in all our struggles and troubles, we are conscious of it in our decrepit helpless old age. Life means being awake, it means growth, it means progress, it means freedom, it means pleasure and joy. A famous text of the Upanishada says that "life proceeds out of pleasure or joy, it lives on joy and it enters joy on death".* It draws a pantheistic inference from it and says that he who knows this joy of the Brahman can have no fear from any cause. There can be no pleasure or joy without the imperfect individual and therefore the pantheistic inference may be ignored. But whence comes this influx of pleasure or joy in life?

Bergson spoke of the impetus of life but he did not see this influx of joy underlying every effort of life. Pain, as it affects consciousness, is not a material effect like the effect of the stroke of hammer on a piece of iron; similarly pleasure is not a material effect. Pain leads to effort. Pleasure or joy proceeds from effort and sustains effort and life. So far as it sustains effort, it is an extraneous force.

Effort is the result of the free willing action of the living being but the co-operation of an extraneous influence is necessary to *sustain* it. The helping

* Taittiriya Upanishada.

hand is necessary to sustain effort and to prevent torpor and lifelessness, and is also necessary in every step in the progress of life, for as we have seen in the last chapter, evolution of higher forms of life is not possible without outside help. The touch of the loving helping hand may explain the mysterious sense of pleasure or joy, which springs from painful effort.

Pain and
immortality

We should here consider one very important matter. The whole question of pain depends upon two circumstances, namely, whether life is eternal and whether individual life by some law is sure to assume a higher and more spiritual form. If individual life is not eternal but only ephemeral, the pains and pleasures of a few years do not matter much. If also individual life does not assume a higher and more spiritual form but continues in its present stage, either enjoying in heaven eternal pleasures, on the model of the earthly pleasures, or enjoying eternal pain, like the pains suffered by it on earth, pleasures and pains do not signify much. Pleasures will in that case soon lose their pleasurable character and ennui and pain will ensue. Continued hopeless and irremediable pain will surely lead to stupor and extinction. Thus the hell and heaven of the prevailing religions will equally lead to the Nirvana of Buddha, but with more trouble and pain than are required by Buddha's method. But if individual life be eternal and if it be continually progressing to higher and more spiritual forms, the pains of life, which are necessary for the result, should be considered good by a person convinced of the fact.

Philosophy is not however so convincing that it can satisfy the utterly miserable individual, who is prepared to commit suicide, or the deer in his agony when he is being slowly eaten up by the tiger. We know the law of nature. Nature is kind to the species but does not spare the individual. Indeed, nature is not even kind to the imperfect species. It destroys it in the process of bringing forth higher forms of life. Philosophy is satisfied with nature. But religion is for the individual. How can the sacrificed individual be satisfied? There are noble minds, who would be million times sacrificed, if more glorious forms are evolved thereby. Jesus, the beloved Son of God, is the exemplar for all time to all beings. Jesus himself was sacrificed by the Father, who loved him above all the world. That makes one pause. But still, until he feels like Jesus, one can not be satisfied and it is on record that for a moment, even Jesus himself became doubtful. Now, if individual existence ends in death and there is nothing beyond, the evolution of more glorious forms of life by the sacrifice of the individual is enough for the satisfaction of any rational moral being. What rational mind views with any concern or pity the iron because it is heated red for producing a fine knife or some wonderful machinery? Who would care for the ephemeral suffering of an ephemeral insect? We have seen before that sympathy for the pain of living beings becomes greater and greater with the greater individuation of the sufferer; pain also is felt more with greater individuation. There would be little pain and little sympathy, if

there was not the fact that individuation becomes greater and greater. The inference arises that pain and sympathy and mercy exist in reference to absolute eternal individuality. However that may be who would care for the pleasures and pains of an ephemeral life? It is only because that it is supposed that individual life is eternal that the question of pain and suffering has any significance. Now when we go to life beyond the grave, we go outside the regions of positive philosophy. Still the most imperative of questions for the living man is, is the individual of no moment in nature or in God's creation, beyond its furnishing a little motive power for the evolution of higher species? It must be apparent to every mind that all the pleasures, all the beauties of nature, all the ideas and ideals, the whole world of sense, thought and ethics, can have any significance only in reference to the individual. Indeed their existence depends on the individual and not on the species. The species only preserves itself and propagates. But all that is high and noble and beautiful in nature appertains to the individual. The individual is thus infinitely more important than the species. The sacrifice required of the individual for the species is the basis of morality. That is the true definition of ethics which can exist only in reference to the individual. The sacrifice of the living individual is necessary for the evolution of higher species but that has meaning only in so far that the higher species will produce the higher individual of the future. The sacrifice of the existing species, indeed all the

forces of nature are required for the evolution of the higher individual,—the individual, seeing, hearing, feeling, working and self-sacrificing. Now can it be true that the present throbbing living individual, which is being sacrificed every moment for the sake of the highest individual which time in its fulness will produce, is of no moment to the forces of nature outside himself and to the Divine Love, if there be any such? If there be a force inherent in nature, and there is undoubtedly such a force, the effect of which evolves thought and beauty, love and sacrifice and ethics, is it possible that it should take no notice of the present individual, upon whom all these depend, in its concern for the future individual? The proof positive may come, I believe it shall surely come, when the mind becomes more spiritualized with the evolution of the higher species. It will be foolish for a man or an ass to assert that there is no such thing as electricity, because the proof of its existence is beyond its little undeveloped mind. Similarly it is foolish to assert, that there is no force in nature or Divine Love which takes care of the individual. The laws of evolution do not disprove the fact but on the contrary go far to prove it. We know that a species itself becomes extinct for the evolution of the higher species, which as we have seen before, is only a means for the evolution of the higher individual. All species are of no moment without the individual. They are dead like a mere idea or matter. Upon them, reason beauty and ethics are not dependent. They may be

compared to the sparrows spoken of by Christ, when he says: "Fear not them which kill the body * * are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? And one of them shall not fall on the ground without your Father. But the very hairs of your head are numbered. Fear not therefore for you are of more value than many sparrows." Therefore fear not, poor, suffering, toiling sinning, dying, crucified man, even the very hairs of your head are numbered by the eternal loving One. The materialist will probably smile at the language and dismiss it as rhetoric. But in regard to the question of pain he must admit that it is scientifically proved that it is good and noble, in as much as it is essential for the evolution of nobler forms of life. To him there is no immortal soul and therefore pain must be regarded as ephemeral and of no greater significance than the stroke of the hammer on iron. The difficulty is of the man who believes in the immortality of the soul. To such a person what has been stated above may seem good reason.

Positive philosophy knows this: Life is by a law of nature invariably accompanied with pain. Pain is thus surely an ingredient in the composition of life. Therefore the existence of pain does not disprove a good and merciful God. I have shown that pain is noble and, to utterly noble minds, it very nearly loses its painful character. More will be known of it in future, Pain shall never lose altogether its painful character, for then all life and all progress shall cease. We have further found that there is a substratum of pleasure in every effort of life and thus

in pain. When men know more and become more spiritualized, pain shall lose much of its terror. In the meantime, one should know that if you accept progressive life, you must accept pain also. Buddha would not accept either. But he attempted the impossible, namely, to quench the fire of Life in this universe. The merciful master, the wisest of all philosophers, was led to this course, because he found no God. He found the secrets of the springs of life and he thought he could stop the machine going further. He was mistaken there, for the machine can not be stopped. To destroy desire and life is impossible. Therefore positive philosophy would regulate desire, so that nobler and more spiritual life may be evolved. Life and desire and pain are noble, and as upon them depend all the splendours of the universe, all beauty and harmony, all goodness and mercy and life ever becoming finer and finer, they are infinitely good. Buddha and the philosophers, who were the wisest and the noblest of our race, had their visions warped by the imperfect knowledge and false speculations about God, prevalent in their time, and were led to believe in the ignoble character of desire and life and thus to denial of God.

Let us see where the facts and consideration mentioned above lead us.

Pain is indispensable for the evolution and progress of life. It is only pain, of which the elementary living being is conscious and which rouses it from its inert condition to motion and action. There would be no life and no progress of life from dead

matter to life and higher life but for pain. Pain is the effect of the material ingredient of the living organism, which is subject to many disturbances, troubles and molestations. It is indispensable for the evolution of the higher structure, the higher sense-organs and the higher life. It is not a negative entity but is as real as matter and life, nor is it the beneficent shadow of pleasure, as George Macdonald and some philosophers would have us believe.

Pain, as we have seen before, accompanies self-consciousness. The sense of pain is all but non-existent in the rudimentary forms of life. Increased individuation is accompanied with increased sense of pain and also with increased sense of pleasure. But as long as life is under the domination of matter, material disturbances leading to pain affect it more than pleasure, as science tells us. With the greater manifestation of the spiritual, the living being becomes less subject to matter, and this may lead to the conclusion that eventually pain will be mastered just as matter will be mastered by life. But it should be remembered that if there be no pain, there will be no effort, and parasitism will inevitably ensue. Bergson has very rightly observed that "however full, however flowing the activity of an animal species may appear, torpor and unconsciousness are always lying in wait for it. It keeps up its role only by effort at the price of fatigue"* and consequent pain. Life is "dogged by automatism. The most living thought becomes frigid in the formula that expresses it. The

*Creative Evolution p. 119.

word turns against the idea. The letter kills the spirit. And our most ardent enthusiasm, as soon as it is externalised into action, is so naturally congealed into cold calculation of interest or vanity, the one takes so easily the shape of the other, that we might confuse them together, doubt our own sincerity, deny goodness and love, if we did not know that the dead retain for a time the features of the living".* Thus when effort and pain are required less and when ease and pleasure get the upper hand, life degenerates to parasitism and ultimately reverts to matter. This biological truth can not be whittled away by arguments of philosophers and religious men. The paramount importance of pain in the existence and growth of the higher powers of life must be recognized.

Further, pleasure is at the root of pain itself. When the living organism gives up the struggle and takes to parasitism, it gets rid of pain and also of the pleasure which is at the base of life. Buddhist Bhikkus and Hindu Sanyasis and Christian monks give up the active efforts of life; they live upon others and avoid the pains of desire and all pains, except these that are self-inflicted and which are therefore productive of no beautiful result. They are at rest like the parasites and may reach salvation, Mukti and Nirvana or the quiescent pleasant condition of a piece of marble or beautiful glass, which is not capable of change or progress.

* Creative Evolution p. 134.

Pleasure is not the contrary of pain. It is also a positive fact of life. It is the very basis of life. Life would not come into being without pain; nothing in life would come into existence without a wrench. Were it not for a marvellous perception of the desirableness of the effects of pain, life would not submit to it. Deep down in the recesses of life is the supreme sense of happiness which it carries with itself. It is the very essence of life.

Pain and life go together. In the beginning there was neither pain nor pleasure. Pain came into existence with life. Pleasure accompanied it. But pain was the master-spring of life's action. Slowly, pleasure has been growing with the development of life and dispossessing pain of its dominance in life. From the very beginning, pain had in it a latent element of supreme pleasure accompanying it. The consciousness of pain makes manifest the consciousness of life, which carries with it the sub-conscious sense of supreme happiness—the sense of supreme satisfaction of a dead person when restored to life. The sense of life and, higher than that, the sense of growing life makes to all life the acutest pain and the keenest pleasure of little moment. That sense is the true joy of life, which is not identical with pleasure derived from material sources. Lastly, we find that the fact of pain accompanies freedom and volition and effort and in co-operation with an ineffable Entity brings about the evolution of higher and still higher life. If God desired to be Himself all in all and to leave living beings no real freedom of action, pain would be inconsistent with

Pain and
freedom and
God.

His goodness and would not exist at all. Pain and pleasure and mercy and love came into existence, because God desired co-operation and free effort and the love of his creatures—why, we do not know nor need we speculate. The fact has led and is leading to results glorious beyond conception. It is enough, if we are satisfied of its existence.

CHAPTER VI.

THE MYSTERY OF EVIL.

We now go to the question of evil. It has exercised the minds of philosophers and scientists from the most ancient times. Sir Oliver Lodge in an article in the Weekly Despatch in 1919 thus described it.

"The problem of evil has exercised the minds of philosophers and poets and thinkers from time immemorial. If there be a God, why is evil permitted? that is one question ; and why does misfortune fall upon the good as well as upon the wicked? that is another. The questions can be differently formulated.

Are goodness and happiness necessarily associated, or ought they to be? That is the essence of the second question.

And is the good either constantly or ultimately dominant over evil, and why is its dominion so hidden? That is part of the essence of the first.

No one can suppose that the answers to such questions are easy, and few imagine that we can answer them with completeness and absolute certainty in the light of merely human knowledge. Hence arise various grades of optimism and pessimism, and even the optimist who believes that good will ultimately prevail is puzzled from time to time at special instances of pain and sorrow and loss, which seem sometimes to fall upon an individual or a nation as

merely hurtful and unmerited afflictions. Recent events have made the difficulty more pronounced. We used to be told that the fittest will survive, but in the inhuman mechanical travesty of modern war it seems rather the fittest who are most likely to succumb. Evil has been rampant on the earth, and its forces seem licensed to the utmost.

Why is scientific savagery permitted? The sword was in old time regarded as an instrument of Divine vengeance; even apart from the sword, plague, pestilence, and famine were spoken of as God's agents; and in the catastrophe of shipwreck, earthquake and volcano we were bidden to hear a warning voice. Peace confers no immunity from pain and disease and temporal loss. The Tower of Siloam falls alike on saint and sinner. The sunshine exercises no discrimination between the just and the unjust. All these things have been a perennial puzzle to man.

That great and ancient poet, the author of the *Book of Job*, tackled these questions, or some of them, in a famous manner, not completely answering them but setting them forth as the theme of a dramatic dialogue or discussion enriched with a literary form which has aroused the admiration as well as the respectful criticism of thousands of scholars. The author of that book seems to have held the Manichæistic view that there is a real conflict between good and evil powers, and that for purposes of testing or demonstration, for the sake of experiment, as it were, the evil is allowed the upper-hand for a time. He suggests clearly and explicitly that it is for humanity to decide whether it shall suc-

cumb to the evil and be overwhelmed or whether through the darkest period of trial it can retain its faith unshaken and can brave to the uttermost all that the evil power may accomplish.

Many attempts have been made to escape from the Manichæan position and to avoid the postulation of two equal or nearly equal powers in conflict with each other, fighting especially for the elevation or degradation of the soul of man and for the healthy or diseased development of all creation.

Eliminating any question of that manifest reality, human sin, and concentrating only on what in the abstract is called evil in an otherwise beneficent creation—such as tormenting insects, loathsome diseases, earthquake and tempest, plague, pestilence, and famine—it is easy to point out that such evils are relative, that they are not bad in themselves any more than extreme cold or raging fire or a stroke of lightning is bad in itself. These things are only hurtful when out of control or out of place; they are hurtful to living organisms, they are hurtful because of the other high development amid which they may occur.

Think how rejoiced a biologist would be if he could construct an active insect such as a horse-fly. The achievement is immeasurably beyond him. Yet to the higher animals this and many wonderful and beautifully designed creatures are an intolerable nuisance calling for extermination.

So it is also even with disease germs. The microbe or bacillus, in so far as it is itself a living

organism, is beyond the power of mankind to imitate; it is suited to its environment and is admirable. But we do not want it in human blood: there it is poisonous and destructive—destructive of things higher than itself, and therefore relatively evil. The conflict of good with good is the essence of all higher tragedy. The inferior may devastate the superior, the less good may be harmful to the higher and the better. Evil is relative, not absolute. In this way the problem of evil has been faced on what may be called its biological side. Nothing is common or unclean.

Modern optimistic writers have gone further than this, and have tried to emphasize what they consider the truth that an element of evil is a necessary ingredient and even an enrichment of the universe, and that a world of unmitigated goodness would be as insipid, and perhaps in the long run as demoralizing as a life of undiluted pleasures.

Pain is the beneficent shadow of pleasure, said George Macdonald; and he went on to ask. Shall we ever learn, may we not hope, that evil is the beneficent shadow of good?

In some such spirit as this many theologians have faced the problem. Without an element of evil and the possibility of succumbing to it, human life would be divested of much of its interest; it would be mechanically not morally perfect, and the training derivable from an experience of real struggle and effort would be absent. If there is light there must be darkness. If there is heat there must be cold. If there is good there must be evil.

The alternations of light and dark, of summer and winter, of growth and decay, of life and death, of pleasure and pain, and also the alternatives of good and evil, seem necessary for all the fullness and completeness of a complex universe. So men have judged, and so it must surely be. Harmony could not be appreciated without the possibility of discord: not only the possibility but the actuality of discord is serviceable in music. Good would be an unreality without the possibility of evil. Pain and sorrow must have their uses in the world.

And yet—why should things be constituted so? The truth may be admitted—regretfully admitted—but why should we be called upon for such admissions? To such propositions as the above attempts at explanation we may give intellectual acquiescence, and yet during a period of sorrow we may feel rebellious, and our faith in ultimate goodness may become weak.

Sometimes we complain that we are the plaything of the gods, or that we are the sport of inhuman forces which are not only beyond our control, but are not subject to control at all. In these moods we feel that there is no dominant power, no guidance or assured destiny, but that we are drifting in a direction determined by inorganic, unmoral, insensitive, fixed and inexorable laws of nature. We must take things as we find them, and acquiesce.

All these attempts at consolation or at philosophic acquiescence in the inevitable fail to bring comfort; indeed during a time of emotional stress it often happens that comfort cannot be attained. So

the age-long discussion continues, with ups and downs appropriate to the times and taking many forms in accordance with human circumstances".

The great scientist is thoroughly imbued with the old Christian idea of natural sin. He further confuses evil with pain and sorrow. Like most scientists he is inclined to scepticism. His observations are quoted as giving a succinct exposition of what he calls the age-long theme and the great "why", as understood in modern times. The questions put by philosophers before him and repeated by him and which are in the mouths of all people must be answered before there can be a religion based on reason.

People talk glibly of good and evil but Socrates clearly demonstrated the difficulty of defining them. History shows us unmistakably how the idea has developed. Long before Moses, religious poets and philosophers of the ancient Aryans saw in light and darkness a continual antagonism. Fire and the Sun became the chief objects of worship. Among the Iranians, the idea grew and got its final shape in the doctrine of the eternal conflict of the good God, Ahura Mazda, and the evil One, Angrimanyu. The same idea seems to have developed among the Egyptian worshippers of the Sun also. Among the Iranians most moral rules and all religious ceremonies were intended to please the good God and to checkmate the evil One. The good God was he who gave rain and crops, health and children. The evil One was he from whom proceeded drought and

pestilence, disease and death. The older priests, the Samans, whom Zarathustra vanquished, considered religion as not only what propitiated the good God but also what pleased the evil One and his satellite gods, the Daevas.

The ethical
idea first mani-
fested in Zarahustrian sys-
tem.

Zarathustra for the first time laid down the doctrine that religion consists in standing for the good and fighting eternally the evil and finally vanquishing it. The idea of the good at first consisted in what was considered desirable and leading to happiness. The ethical idea was of later growth. It undoubtedly began with Zarathustra who inculcated the doctrine of the necessity of fighting the evil One and of refusing to propitiate him. As long as the good spirit and the evil spirit were both worshipped, there could be no distinction between the good and the evil. No sooner was the distinction made and further, men were emboldened to stand up and to fight the evil One, ethics came into existence. The glory belongs to Zarathustra of making ethics manifest among men.

The develop-
ment of the
idea in India.

The Indo-Aryans seceded from the Iranians on the great question and persisted in worshipping the Devas but the seed sown by Zarathustra was not lost and soon the Hindu Devas became good gods and the ethical idea developed rapidly among the Indian Aryans, who prospered greatly in India. Philosophy found its home in India, and manifested its manifold forms. The philosophic Rishi however considered not only the evil gods but also the good gods of little moment and developed

the doctrine of Karma and one of them boldly declared "I bow to Karma, over which even the great God can not prevail". Dharma and good Karma were considered the good, irrespective of any God. They consisted in conforming to the rules of conduct laid down in the revealed books and performing the ancient ceremonies which were declared to be Dharma or the Law.

The Jews imbibed the idea of the conflict between the good God and his angels and the evil One and his angels from their more civilized and powerful neighbours. Thus they and the Christians after them got the idea of good and evil. Moses laid down the ten commandments, the ordinary moral rules governing society at his time and a code of ritual for the worship of the good God, which were declared to be revealed and were the Law, just as among the Hindus. The infringement of this Law was sin. Jesus declared the inviolability of this Law. Christians have defined Sin as the violation of the Law. Christians use the word Sin as equivalent to evil. The orthodox definition of sin has been mentioned before. In order to reconcile the idea of sin and evil with a righteous God, Jewish and Christian divines considered that a few thousand years ago there was no sin or evil. Adam, the first man, was tempted by Eve to transgress the command of God, the first Law, not to eat the fruit of the tree of knowledge and thus Sin came into existence and with it the power of the evil One. Christ incarnated to deliver men from inherited sin and to destroy Satan. Un-

fortunately evil has prospered greatly since then and the evil One is quite as powerful as before.

Thus with all their attempts to terrify and mystify, which have misled philosophers, there is not much of a mystery in the Christian idea of evil and sin. It is the infringement of revealed law and thus no more mysterious than the criminality attaching to the infringement of the codified criminal law of a country.

History tells us that ethics has developed with the growth of reason and spirituality, in spite of revealed religions which would stereotype conduct and stifle every attempt at progress. But the codification of good social rules and enforcing them upon the people by the powers of the State and fears of hell made those rules and ideas arising out of them parts of the conduct of not a few elect but of all men and thus facilitated further progress. The revealed religions with all their errors have been thus of supreme service to man.

The philosophers, Christian and pagan, have however not been able to shake off the old ideas of the conflict between the good God and the evil One nor the idea that the good was that which procured happiness. The questions put by Sir Oliver Lodge are the questions of philosophers and scientists and of common men. Why does not the good God prevail over the evil One? When is the long-drawn fight between the two to end in the final victory of the former? Are not goodness and happiness associated

with one another? Why does the good God allow unhappiness to come in the train of goodness? The questions are put and declared to be insoluble. People can not therefore be blamed for being unbelievers in a good God.

But the questions are all based on the old ideas of Zarathustra of the conflict between the good God, who gave sunshine and warmth and light, rain and crops and health and all things leading to happiness, and the evil One, who brought droughts and blights, diseases and pestilences. Rationalists and critical historians take the doctrines of dogmatic Christianity and the opinions of philosophers and tear them to shreds and proceed forthwith to deny God. But if they had viewed the question from a historical point of view, they would have found the origin of these dogmas and their true worth and that they could not in any way lead to an inference against the existence of God.

Rationalists rightly assert that the dogmas of revealed religious have little to do with ethics and still they deny God because of them. You may deny the God who forbade the eating of the fruit of knowledge but what justification have you, on that account, to deny the true God, through Whom all reason and knowledge have developed?

But we can not find much fault with the rationalists. All professors of religion and priests, Christian Hindu and Mahomedan, are continually harping on Sin and all sermons are pointless without pictures of

Position of
rationalists in-
consistent.

Erroneous
ideas of evil
justify unbe-
lief.

punishment and terror for sinners after death. All revealed religions declare that the unbeliever is not he who denies God but who denies the authority of the revelations, and that such an unbeliever goes to eternal hell. Philosophy which has long been in the charge of privileged priests of revealed religions, has been greatly influenced by the above ideas and has adopted the view that there is universal sin, evil and sorrow as an admitted fact of life. All rational minds, who have the courage of their convictions, have found such views inconsistent with the existence of a good God and have been driven to pure atheism and the less courageous to agnosticism. Atheistic and materialistic books make this the main argument against the existence of God. How they dilate on the evil, the sorrow, the pain and the cruelty that is in nature! What gruesome pictures we have of life and of nature and of God, if any!

The real
facts.

But what is the real fact? There is no doubt that evil and sorrow and pain and cruelty, as we understand the terms now, exist. But let us begin from pure matter and the beginning of life. There all these do not exist. As life becomes more developed, these manifest themselves more and more. Pain is not felt at all in the stage of life, where life is hardly distinguishable from non-life. As life becomes more distinct from matter, pain begins to be felt. The higher the living being becomes, the greater is the pain felt by it. Thus the feeling of pain and sorrow increases with the growth of life and is an accompaniment of it in its upward course of progress. You may choose the state of dead matter

and of Nirvana or the state of life where it is hardly distinguishable from matter or other lower forms of life in which pain is less felt than by men. But that would be irrational. Evil also there was not, when life was all but matter. What we call evil was good and absolutely necessary for the preservation of life in less advanced stages of life as we shall presently see. The idea of the Good is growing with the progress of life. The materialists dilate upon the cruelty that is in nature. The lower and weaker forms of life are devoured for their subsistence by the stronger. These philosophers forget that they eat meat and even the merciful vegetarian forgets that vegetables have life. The difficulty may be avoided by declaring that beasts have no souls and vegetables have no life. But that can no longer satisfy the scientist. But what is the fact again. There is no cruelty or mercy in matter or in forms of life which are hardly distinguished from life. The pain of being torn to pieces or being devoured is not much felt by the victim in that stage. A man does not feel any mercy at the fate of a plant from which he violently plucks a flower or which is torn to pieces by him for food. Cruelty consists in feeling that another is being hurt by it. Mercy is the noble feeling which grows in life with its progress.

Now God has so ordained that from dead matter in which there is no pain, no sorrow, no evil, no sin, no cruelty, no mercy, life is evolved and with the progress of life there come into existence in an increasing degree pain and sorrow, the sense of evil and the sense of cruelty. Goodness, mercy, self-sacrifice, beauty and reason are the direct re-

sults of the process. Does the process disprove the existence of God? Surely it is the strongest proof that the Father exists.

Desire is
sin according
to religious
men and philo-
sophers.

It was Buddha who alone among philosophers was unaffected by the old dogmas. The philosopher of clear vision declared what alone was evil according to the ideas of life as understood till Darwin appeared. The evil One he recognized as the origin of all sins the *Papiyan*. That evil One was Mara, the God of desire. Mara's other name was Kama, the God of love, son of Krishna. But Buddha's Mara was the God of all desire. All philosophers, western and eastern, have considered desirelessness as a state of supreme virtue. Hindu ascetics and Christian monks would consider carnal love and other desires as sinful. Thus if we leave aside the definition of sin as transgression of the Mosaic Law, when the doctrine is impartially considered and analysed, it will be found that it means that evil is conduct which leads to pain now or ultimately in hell on account of the displeasure of God, and goodness or virtue is what leads to pleasure now or ultimately in heaven. In reality according to such doctrines evil means the cause of pain and goodness means the cause of pleasure. This leads us to the philosophic definition of evil by Buddha, which was practically accepted by all philosophers and religious men after him. That definition of evil is that it is desire. He said the pleasures of heaven are transitory and repudiated the doctrine of revealed religions. He said that the definition of believers in the Gods of revealed religion is based on the desire

to obtain pleasure and to avoid pain. He found all desire was evil. It was desire which was at the root of life and its sufferings and the whole object of philosophy and religion is to extinguish desire and to vanquish Mara the God of desire. Hindus accepted his position. The famous book the Bhagabat Gita declares desirelessness as the goal of religion. The great God Siva is described as burning to ashes Kama, the God of love. Unfortunately, Indra and the other Gods induced Siva to revive Kama. But Buddha and the other philosophers cannot destroy desire. It is at the root of life. If desire is evil, life is evil. Buddha affirms it is. But positive philosophy and the scientific evolutionist say he did not know the facts of life and thus fell into a grave error.

Let us see how the idea of good and evil have been considered as apart from that of sin. Even in Zoroaster and Moses's time the good God was merely the God from whom pleasant things proceeded to his worshippers and the evil One was the spirit from whom unpleasant things proceeded. Christ was offered by Satan the good things of the world, and Buddha, who had them all, was offered much more by Mara, but they both rejected them, because the latter was of opinion that they led to pain and sorrow and the former thought it unwise to lose one's soul and to go to eternal hell for them. Disguise the fact as we may, the underlying motive of religious and moral acts up to the present day among men is that they ordinarily consider that which is pleasant is good

and that which is painful is evil. Even what is morally evil is considered evil because it leads ultimately to pain in hell. Priests and preachers and moral philosophers of all nations and religions are always insisting upon the painful consequences of immoral and wicked actions. To an ordinary mind therefore the evil is evil because it proves to be ultimately painful. The idea is well-expressed in Plato's *Protagoras* where, though Socrates brings in courage, justice and piety within the definition of the good, he considers the good as meaning the pleasant, not only what is pleasant at the present moment but also what may be painful now but may lead to greater pleasure in the future. But Plato had a higher idea of the greatest or the absolute good, as we shall presently see.

In the beginning of the *Philebus*, Socrates says :
"Philebus then asserts that the good to all animals is joy and pleasure and delight and whatever else harmonizes with such kinds of things. But what I contend for is that it is not those things but to be wise and to understand and to remember and whatever is of a kindred nature, both correct opinion and true reasoning; are better and more acceptable than pleasure, who are able to partake in them."* Socrates concludes the discourse by showing that both pleasure and wisdom were not the good. "But when a third was discovered superior to either of these two, mind (or wisdom) appeared a thousand fold nearer related and more closely adhering to the form of the

* Burgess' Translation of Plato Vol. IV. p. 1.

conqueror than pleasure did."* Plato did not propound a positive definition of good. But the good he speaks of is the absolute good or perfection, which shall always remain undefined. He considered the good as something different from all accepted ideas of it but which was more akin to wisdom than to any other thing.

The ethical idea originated with the philosophers and puritans, the first of whom according to recorded history was Zoroaster. It slowly grew. The philosophers pondered over the good and ultimately came to the conclusion that it was identical with wisdom. It was the Indian philosophers who first thus glorified wisdom: knowledge was the Good ignorance alone was evil. Buddha's Dharma meant the knowledge of the laws of life and sorrow and the cause of sorrow. In the Vedanta true knowledge was identified with God himself. The philosophers of Greece and following them many of the philosophers of Europe also regarded wisdom as the supreme good.

Modern moral philosophers have come to the position that the good is what leads to the happiness of the community or humanity, as some would like to put it. The evil is its contrary. Reason alone determines what is good and evil. But they do not glorify wisdom like the ancient philosophers as being capable of itself, in the present stage of human progress, to procure the highest happiness to the individual. Other and greater philosophers have disagreed with this position and rightly asserted that we appreciate the good by the innate consciousness

of value in the mind, but even admitting that, the function of reason must be considered as of paramount importance in determining the good.

It is clear that transgression of revealed Law is not always evil nor is desire always evil nor is disobedience of rules enforced by society or state always evil and it is also clear that our reason is fallible. What then is evil? Socrates showed the impossibility of defining the good. The good is however a real entity but undefinable as it is always changing, assuming unforeseeable more glorious forms, and has an ideal existence in an idea which is always changing; the evil is only its nominal opposite. So far as it is a tangible something it means dereliction of duties considered and enforced as such by society, custom, state, or transgression of rules laid down in revealed works. Philosophers declared that desire alone was evil. Darkness and hailstorm disease and pestilence and all such things have been considered evil, understood as meaning things undesirable and painful. Even Sir Oliver Lodge would include pain within the definition of evil. Thus it has been always. The spiritual definition of evil as the entity out of which the good or what is truer; the better or more spiritual is evolved has been ignored. That definition will not be consistent with the position of religious men and philosophers, which rationalists rightly say can lead but to one logical conclusion that there is no God. The position of Indian philosophers that God and pain and evil can not exist at the same time is correct in strict logic. The absolutely good One and his contrary evil cannot certainly exist together, if evil and

good are what the religious dogmatists assert. Their false ideas are the strongest arguments of atheists. If they persist in their error, they will surely drive all men in time to atheism.

Let us now consider the idea of sin and its history.

Very early among the Aryan races we find traces of the idea of evil and sin. The God of purity is Asura Varuna*, one of the oldest of Aryan deities. He has been identified with Ahura Mazda or the good God of the Iranians. Among the Indian Aryans he was considered to be a very pure God, who was stern and unrelenting. In the Rig Veda there are noble hymns to Varuna, some of the noblest composed by man. In the first of them we find: "O King Varuna! may Thy good will be wide and deep! keep Thou the evil (One) overpowered far from us. Deliver us from the sins committed by us."† Now what is this sin? In the next hymn we find: "as people commit errors, we also day after day err in the performance of Thy Bratas. O Varuna do Thou not despise us for that and destroy us. Be not angry with us."‡ This word Brata is repeated in the Vedas and Manus and all religious books, indeed is found in all Sanscrit literature in two senses: (1) of austere ceremony, (2) of duty. Probably originally it meant the strict performance of the ceremonies for the worship of the good God. The utmost purity in the worshipper was considered indispensable for

History of
the idea of sin.

* Max Muller says he is identical with Ouranos of the Greeks.

† Rig Veda, Mand 24 Suk 9.

‡ Rig veda I Mand 25 Suk 1.

such worship. Any dereliction was considered a grave offence to God and thus Sin. This idea is expressed in the words "Thy Bratas". But the essence of the idea was an unexpressed indefinite feeling of purity and goodness inseparable with the idea of the good God. From this the idea of Duty slowly evolved. In later hymns we find sin defined as being of two kinds : (1) offences towards the gods, (2) offences towards friends, relatives neighbours, beneficent persons and the imbecile distressed.* Two other noble hymns run as follows: "O Varuna deliver us from the evil inherited from our ancestors and also from the evil committed in this body of ours. Release us from evil, us, who are like cattle-thief or calf bound with ropes. O Varuna ! This sin or evil is not through my fault. It has been done through error or wine or anger or gambling or wrong judgment. The younger brother is sometimes led to evil by (a loving) elder brother ; sin arises even from dreams. I shall serve without evil, like a slave, the supporter Varuna, who gives all desired good things. We are without understanding, may the God of good will give us understanding."† "Varuna who is merciful even to sinners * * may we be without sin towards Him"‡. We thus find the idea of duty developed from that of duty of the ceremonial worship of God,—from the duty to God to duty towards men. The dereliction of such duty was considered evil or sin. The Christian idea of inherited sin is there but it

Sin and
duty.

* Rig Veda 1 Mand 185 Suk 8; 5 Mand 85 Suk V.

† Rig Veda 7 Mand 86 Suk, 6, 7.

‡ Rig Veda 7 Mand 87 Suk 7.

is not the irrational doctrine of sin irredeemable except with the blood of Christ and except in respect of believers in such doctrine. It is there expressed in the rational sense of such inherited tendency to evil being rightly considered as a palliative of offences. It further gives expression to the profound truth that no one does what he considers evil with full understanding of its nature ; and that one does, what he considers evil, always under the influence of passion or error of judgment, when he is not strictly master of himself.

The worshipper of Varuna is however also conscious of another profound truth that whatever he may do, he always falls short of the standard of the goodness and purity of God. Like Jesus, he felt that God alone was good. He stands in awe of that transcendent and undefined purity of Him, who alone can perform all duties and who maintains the Law which upholds the universe and who is stern and unrelenting in maintaining such law, the least infringement of which would destroy in a moment the wonderful orderly world of matter and life and spirit. The agonized cry goes up : " O Varuna, I am going to (death) with a body trembling with fear, like a cloud driven hither and thither by winds. I have committed sins, because of weakness, because of want of understanding, because of inadvertence. O Thou good One ! be merciful, unto me " * The ancient purist can find nothing sufficiently pure and is doubtful whether he can do any thing by which he can avoid the dis-

Sin and
remorse.

* Rîg Veda 7 Mand 89 Suk.

pleasure of the pure One and says that he has asked the wise what is evil or sin and they have only told him Varuna is displeased with him. He asks in despair "O Varuna, tell me what is evil".* To be sure the ancient purists and philosophers of Iran and India had a very exalted idea of purity and goodness, of which their descendants even in the twentieth century have little appreciation. This pure stream of the philosophy of goodness reached Judea but the Semitic mind of the Jews could not grasp the subtlety of the Aryan philosopher, and a very irrational and unphilosophic idea of sin was evolved by the Jews and from them by their Christian followers. So great is the influence of inherited belief in miracles and revealed books enforced by States originally, that even the great minds of the advanced Aryan nations of Europe and America have found it difficult to shake off the old erroneous doctrine, and great modern philosophers have found reason, because of the undefinable character of evil and sin, not to discard doctrines clearly unreasonable, on the supposition that they were revealed by God incarnate or by prophets and apostles inspired by Him. We have already described the unreal and unreasonable character of sin of the Jewish and Christian theologians.

The definition of sin as distinguished from evil.

But there is a real and rational idea of evil and sin. It can not be denied that there is an innate consciousness of evil and sin in the human mind. The distinction between evil and sin is that the former is what is opposed to our idea of the good, which is pro-

*Rig veda 7 Mand 86 Suk 3.

gressive, and the latter arises out of the anxious desire, existing deep down in our hearts, of pleasing the Father and the Lover and is the sense of the inadequacy of all our efforts to please Him as we ought. We regard with keen regret our transgression of any duty, which we consider displeases God and which we thus consider as sin and as worse than any other evil or sorrow or pain.

Let us consider further the true character of evil. It must be admitted that what we call evil is something which is absolutely necessary for the preservation of Life. As high intelligence has been evolved from all but dead matter, so high morality has been evolved out of what was practically the negation of it. Poor, weak, helpless creatures cannot preserve themselves without deceit. Deceit has made nature beautiful. The beautiful and variegated colours of birds, butterflies and animals are results of the attempt of Nature to hide her poor weak creatures from the destroying stronger animals. Falsehood and deceit are not contemptible in the economy of nature. Robbery and misappropriation had great virtues in the progress of life. Killing, the capacity to murder, was considered, and in the cause of nationality or for glory, is still considered the noblest of virtues, even among the most civilized nations. Chastity was unknown to the savage. The idea of chastity, as it prevailed among Hindus, who burned their widows, would have been destructive of the species, if it prevailed among all men in the beginning. Selfishness alone preserved life.

Morality is what tends to the preservation, the happiness, and above all, the progress, intellectual and spiritual, of living beings. In that sense, selfishness, deceit, robbery, murder and unchastity, as we understand them, were good at a time. Now they are or have become evil. They are necessary concomitants of the evolution of life from non-life, of the spirit from non-spirit. Science and positive philosophy cannot but consider evil in its reality and viewed in the light of truth, how can it be considered inconsistent with the existence, of the supremely good God? The question can arise only in the fancies and vain imaginings of priests and so called religious men, who are intolerant of what they consider vice in others and are ever ready to stone the adulteress on the strength of what they consider the revealed commands of God in books or tablets handed by the great God himself to favoured prophets or incarnations, and on absolute unreason. Science and positive philosophy eschew such fancies and imaginings and to them, what is considered evil is a characteristic of undeveloped growing life, which is necessary for the preservation of life at certain stages and for the evolution of the highest life and of the absolutely good. Positive philosophy finds that the evil of the dogmatic religious men leads to the beauty and the glory of the great panorama of Nature; it is a sign of the great mercy, the great love unexplained of the good God. Darkness is supposed to be the kingdom of Satan and light that of God. But darkness without doubt adds to the beauty and the splendour of nature. Without it, light would be intolerably ugly and there

would be no beauty in nature at all. This is an unsatisfactory analogy. Evil is not like darkness nor is goodness like light. It is an entity which is wholly spiritual. We have only an imperfect form of it in life, in which materiality predominates at present. It is becoming better and better.

There is a great difference between pain and evil. Pain proceeds mainly from disturbances in the material part of the organism. It is spiritual so far as it is felt as pain. But evil does not proceed from material affections. The sense of the good or the evil is wholly spiritual; matter or rudimentary life had no such sense. It has grown with the growth of life, consciousness and individuality. We have seen before how mercy has evolved from cruelty.

The ideas of good and evil are ideas connected with life. They assume higher, nobler and more spiritual forms but the later form has little in common with what it supplants. Thus deceit, cruelty, robbery, killing and unchastity rule the lower forms of life. They are slowly supplanted by their contrary. As long however as the former exist with the latter, the former are considered evil and the latter good. In the course of the evolution of higher and more spiritual life, a higher form of goodness slowly manifests and supplants the earlier idea of the good which is then considered as evil. The woman who had many men was considered lucky and good at a time. Slowly the idea got hold of the mind of man that woman should have only one man and her having more than one was the greatest evil for her. Divorce was not

allowed and remarriage was a great sin. Now the Sati, who burns herself, and her relatives, are punished by the criminal Courts. One does not know what fine form sexual purity will take in time. It is unforeseeable, like all changes of life, as rightly observed by Bergson. The same observation applies to every thing which we consider evil or good. We shall describe the process of the evolution of the good more fully in the next chapter. What we find is that at a certain stage of life, a certain mode of conduct is necessary for the preservation of life and for the evolution of higher life. That is good at that stage of life. As life advances to a higher stage, a higher mode of conduct supplants the earlier mode. The first mode is then recognized as evil and the second is considered good. As life advances in its upward career, it finds the mode of conduct, which once preserved it, no longer necessary and recognises it as evil, and casts it aside like the skin cast away by a serpent.

But at any stage of our progress a certain mode of conduct is recognized by us as moral and good. That feeling is always based on reason and on an innate faculty which obliges us to prefer sacrifice of pleasure, material interests and even of life itself for an end approved by it. The philosophers considered reason alone to be the guiding faculty. Indeed there is a difficulty in differentiating between reason and pure ethics but there is such a distinction. Plato made the position clear by asserting that the good was superior to wisdom though it

was a thousand-fold "nearer related" to it than any other thing. The ethical principle in life is a reality. It is always developing. But it can not develop unless the living being subordinates self-interest to it at any stage of its progress. The good for a person is the good as recognized by his reason and ethical faculty. I mention reason, because the ethical faculty is so ill-developed now that if it be against reason it is not safe to follow its dictates. Plato was right when he said that reason was very nearly related and "closely adhered to the form of the good." Therefore the dictate of reason cannot be ignored in deciding what is the good. Our present idea of the good, according to our reason and the innate power of appreciating the value in spirituality of things, is thus the good for us, and our present idea of evil is something which is opposed to the said good, and *that which tends to defeat it must be considered as evil. This is practical ethics and is the basis of all morality and moral philosophy.

In life there is only progressive good. As individuality and powers of life become greater and higher and more spiritual, something in life makes it progress towards the absolute good. The step of the ladder which leads to the good, as soon as it is left for a higher one, is regarded as evil. But the step is necessary for life to ascend. The ladder leads to heaven and every step of it is golden, indeed made of more precious and beautiful elements than gold. Life is noble and glorious and any thing necessary for its preservation is surely not ignoble. Life and its strivings in low animals seem ridiculous and

What is
evil?

ignoble to man, and the strivings of men seem ridiculous and ignoble and evil to angels. Life takes some time to manifest its glories. Its lower stages and the intervals between the stages of progress are what are made much of by short-sighted and impatient persons. But when considered in reference to its glorious destiny, every action, every effort of life is noble and glorious. The Lord of life delights in the apparently ignoble efforts of tiny, weak, erring living beings. Error is the very essence of freedom which is the basis of life. "Trial and error" of the biologists prove freedom in the living being. Without error life would be an automaton and reach the highest form at once and attain Nirvana. Indéed, without error there would be no active or real life and no stages of progress. God ordained freedom which connotes error. Let those, that dare, find fault with Him and send His poor, weak, erring children to eternal hell as evil. But to the eye of truth, error and what is called evil are parts of, and are indispensable for, the unspeakable splendours of this universe of life and for the manifestation of the kingdom of the spirit.

That which is cast away by the living being in its way to the pure spirit is evil and that which it puts on in its place, led by reason and its innate consciousness of value and desire to evolve the higher life, is good, till that too becomes too material and ignoble for it and is cast away. Thus is the pure spirit, the absolute good, being evolved. But life has no idea of the absolute good. It only knows the better and the more spiritual, as we have seen before.

CHAPTER VII.

THE EVOLUTION OF THE GOOD.

Biology and history of human institutions have shaken the foundations of morality which we were taught to believe in. But the ideas of the religious teachers who have been hitherto the great upholders of morality and of the great philosophers about goodness have a value which cannot be ignored.

Let us first consider the position of the religious teachers of the great prevailing religions. They assert that the rules of morality were revealed to man by God and are eternal and unchangeable. The Jews and Christians assert that morality is based on the ten commandments contained in the tablet delivered to Moses by God on Mount Sinai. The Mohammedans believe that the entire and final code of morality is to be found in the Koran, which was delivered to Mahomet by God. Hindus believe that the rules of morality are all to be found in the Vedas and Smritis composed by God-inspired Rishis and they are thus divine and infallible. But modern historical investigators have destroyed all these claims to novelty and divine character.

About 5000 years before Christ, the moral code and wise rules about philosophic life were well-known to Egyptians. Truth even under difficult circumstances and avoidance of "chicanery, crooked ways, worthlessness and laziness" and of "sinning in words that wounded and malicious gossip" and of ignorance were

recommended by the pyramid-builders, and people were asked to be of good courage in adversity and told that "existence lowly or lofty was liable to change and that if they were good in prosperity when adversity came they would be able to endure". The motto of Amenhotep IV was "Living in truth." The moral codes of the Egyptians, of the Vedas, of Zoroaster and of Confucious were as good as could be desired and contained all the rules of Moses and other divine prophets. Moses' tablet copied the rules of morality which were then current among the Egyptians who were the masters of the Israelites and more civilized than they. History thus ruthlessly destroys the claim to divine inspiration of all the moral codes of Manu and Moses, of Christ and Mahomet.

Most of the rules of morality current among men now were evolved in human society in very ancient times. Since then they changed very little, just like the methods of agriculture, till very recent times, when the exact sciences and social philosophy came into existence. They have been changing very fast since the French Revolution.

Let us now go to the great philosophers, who have tried to define goodness and the basis of ethics.

Socrates and Plato for the first time showed the hollowness of the claims of philosophers to define the good. They were however of opinion that moral ideas were immutable, permanent and eternal and not conventional. According to them, morality was not merely wisdom but "reason was very nearly related and closely adhered to the form of the good"

Aristotle says that the greatest pleasure attends the best exercise of our faculties, which is concerned with the highest things *i. e.*, the being and laws of the universe. and this philosophic life he calls the good, and upon it, he bases morality.

Herbert Spencer laid down: "Morality is a code of rules proper for the guidance of humanity in its highest conceivable perfection. Right principles of action become practical only as men become perfect."

Philosophers of the altruistic school maintain pleasure and self-love are opposed to morality.

Kant identifies free-will with practical reason and maintains that freedom is the foundation of ethics. Whatever view of ethics we may take, it is clear that its basis is freedom, for goodness can never be predicated of conduct compelled by the force of others. It is also quite clear that it is the reason of man that can determine, like all other kinds of truth, what is best for man. The data of Kant are: (1) Nothing can be right for me which is not right for all persons in similar circumstance; (2) I can not regard the fulfilment of my desires or happiness as intrinsically more desirable or more to be regarded by me as a rational end than the equal happiness of every one else. For all practical purposes for the determination of right conduct, the rule of Kant is sufficient.

Kant's main doctrine is that the *ought* is an absolute imperative. He however, describes conscience not as our own inner voice but as the voice of the

race. Philosophic speculation not based on facts of life often leads even the greatest of men to inconsistent positions.

Hobbes identifies morality with rational self-love. Butler says that "in the promptings of sense, no less than in those of intellect and reason, we find the phenomena of disinterested impulse." Many philosophers and scientists agree with Condillac that what is longed for is good and what is abhorred is evil.

Mill's observations about conscience.

Mill in his great book on Liberty says: "Duty is a thing which may be exacted from a person as one exacts a debt. Unless we think that it may be exacted from him we do not call it duty." Speaking of conscience and moral sense he says: "The rules which obtain among themselves appear as self-evident and self-justifying. This all but universal illusion is one of the examples of the magical influence of custom and habit which is not only as the proverb says a second nature but is continually mistaken for the first. People are accustomed to believe and have been encouraged in the belief by some who aspire to the character of philosophers that their feelings on subject of this nature are better than reason and make reason unnecessary." There is great truth in the observation but it ignores the basic principles of life found by biology mentioned before

The jurists and the lawyers probably have more rational ideas of duty and morality than others. Austin in his book on Jurisprudence rightly held that law was a command of the sovereign enforced by

sanction from which duty proceeded. Custom and usage when enforced by the State became law. Sir Henry Maine in his famous book on Ancient Law has shown the process, how the moral became legal and how what was legal was relegated to what was merely moral. The moral ideas have been changing as is evidenced by the changes in the law. Morality and law are dependent on each other. Without the sanction of Society and afterwards of the State, enforcing moral duties, there would be no sense of duty and conscience, say with great truth the rationalists. Manu defined morality and virtue as depending on revelation, conduct of good men, custom and self-satisfaction. No philosopher has pointed out any other source of morality. Barring revelation, morality must be considered to have been evolved out of social customs. In all systems of law a distinction is made between legal and moral liability. Moral obligations when enforced by the State became legal obligations and the latter, when changing ideas of convenience and morality required, became only moral obligations. In ancient times among Aryan races sons were considered under a legal obligation to pay the father's debts, whether they inherited any property from them or not. Among Hindus the liability was in later times relegated to the category of venial moral delinquencies. Among European nations no moral taint at all attaches to a son inheriting no property when he refuses to pay his father's debts. This is an instance how a rule of morality has lost its moral character, when it has

Position of
the jurists and
the lawyers.

ceased to be enforced by law*. Indeed, as Mill rightly tells us, Recht, from which Right and Righteousness are etemologically derived, originally meant law.*

How laws
and moral
ideas change.

The facts mentioned above however do not prove that there is no such thing as morality and that there is only law. Law is - the visible manifestation of the ethical element in life recognized by Society and State. Human laws are constantly changing in consequence of the change of moral ideas. The fact is conclusive proof that ideas of morality are not absolute and final but are progressive and always progressing. Alexander Sutherland in his valuable book on the Origin and Growth of the Moral Instinct has conclusively shown how the evolution of ethics in human Society is progressive in the stages of (1) the savage races, (2) the barbarians, (3) semi-civilized races, (4) civilized races and (5) educated men. The reader is referred to that book for a detailed description of the process.

The ration-
listic position
that morality
is independent
of religion.

Rationalistic philosophers assert that morality is independent of religion. Mr. Gorham in his book on the Ethics of the Great Religions thus sums up the result of his historical investigations: "Religion and morals occupy different departments of life. The objections which apply to the one do not apply to the other. The philosophical batteries which are shattering dogmas and creeds into fragments have no force against those moral concepts which a long course of experience has proved not only to be beneficial but indispensable to human welfare. The foundations of religion on its intellectual side are speculative, chang-

ing and unverifiable, those of morality are established, practical and permanent. Is there any reason to suppose that, if Christianity gave up the doctrine of atonement, men will cease to be honest or women virtuous? Has Buddhism been so great a failure? * * We have the law of the land as a terror to evil-doers. We have the interest of the Community, which knows well enough that honesty is the best policy, a statement equivalent at its lowest, to saying that rational grounds exist for moral actions * * All intellectual statements of religious truth are temporary * * The ethical element which theology has assimilated is really that which gives religion its immense hold on the human heart. Dogmas decay and pass into oblivion like mists before the rising sun; but the sense of righteousness remains forever to appeal to the sympathies of struggling men and women. In their doctrinal aspects religions differ widely; in their practical claims they unite in requiring obedience to the elementary principles of right. The principles exist independently of any religion, while making themselves felt in all". It is undoubtedly true that the moral rules laid down in the Vedas, the Buddhist scriptures, the books of Confucius and the Bible and in the books of positivists, materialists, agnostics and atheists and followers of ethical societies are practically identical. It is also true that religious teachers have sought to base their peculiar dogmas, which science and history have found to be superstitious and false, on moral ideas and have misled their followers into thinking that without them all morality would cease to exist. It is also true that "dogmas de-

cay and pass into oblivion like mists before the rising sun; but the sense of righteousness remains forever." It is however not true that the rules of morality are "established, practical and permanent". History shows us that the rules of morality are as changing as the ideas of religion. Conduct as regulated by "the law of the land" acting "as a terror to evil doers" and also public opinion is considered morality.

The rules of such morality are as changing as the much decried dogmas of religion. Falsehood and unchastity were considered good at certain stages of human progress. During the last great war, highly civilized Christian nations as well as followers of nationalistic ethical systems, indulged systematically in flagrant falsehood and violation of all the rules of the ten commandments with the approbation of the religious teachers of their respective nations. The fact did not prove that these nations were immoral. It only showed that the law of self-preservation moulds the rules of secular morality in all countries and in all times. But above the supreme law of self-preservation is the higher law of progress. True morality is based on that law. Morality is not possible without the Lord of Righteousness ordering the progress of living beings from dead unmoral matter to ethical spiritual living beings. The very essence of ethics is the purity of the heart and obedience to the spiritual law of progress which overrides the law of self-preservation. In sacrificing itself for the good, life obeys its Lord. We abhor our subjection to and are in

Morality not
possible with-
out God.

constant rebellion against all material laws, which may preserve our life. But we lovingly obey the spiritual law of progress which requires ever the sacrifice of the self. Sidgwick has said that without the Searcher of the heart no sense of purity is possible. However that may be, we all know the merciful Lord of life and unconsciously trust Him and sacrifice ourselves for the greater good. Thus true morality is not possible without religion. The rules of morality and the dogmas of religions are changing constantly. The ideas of ethics and the ideas of God are not "established and permanent" They are always progressing. Positive religion is based on this fundamental principle of life.

We have next to consider the utilitarian idea of the good. Bentham must be considered as having laid down a very tangible and practical rule when he said that the greatest happiness of the greatest number is the only right and proper end of human actions.

The greatest happiness at present known of the greatest number of existing human beings is certainly a practical end to be sought. But its achievement perpetuates the existing form and does not lead to the evolution of the higher form of life. Ethics as conceived by us was not in the primitive man. It has grown with the growth of the senses, the feelings, and the mind. It has no part in blind, unfeeling, cruel Nature. It contradicts the natural law and comes into existence out of self-love in a form destructive of self-love. Kant rightly says that "the

natural determination of the will is not by motives of pleasure and pain, but when our action is truly rational, a higher law of causation comes into play.' What is this higher law? Reason no doubt is the main factor in the determination of the Good. Reason perceives the Good as beyond the ordinary natural rules of pleasures and pain. Reason always tries to define the Good but always fails, for the Good is always changing and assuming noble and nobler shapes, of which reason itself can have no conception at any given stage of human progress. We must be guided by reason. But we can not but wonder at the forms which the Good has assumed among men, since the type, man, was evolved. There surely is a law of causation higher than the laws of blind, cruel, unreasoning, unethical Nature. There are two guiding principles of life. One is what Spinoza describes as that which impels a living being to preserve its own being. The biologist calls it the overmastering instinct in life. The other is not yet recognized by the scientist. It is the principle in life which leads to higher forms of life. Pleasure has been rightly described as the effect of the fulfilment of the desire to conserve one's own being. The philosophers who base morality on self and pleasure regard this pleasure as the only one kind of pleasure existing. But there is another kind of pleasure arising out of the fulfilment of the imperative law of life which evolves the higher form of life. This the philosophers have not considered in all its glorious possibility. Spinoza, Kant and other transcendental philosophers say that reason is the essence of the being of man and

morality is based upon its best exercise. It is true to some extent. But the second principle governing life mentioned above is the true foundation of the Good. If the evolution of the higher form of life is admitted, it must also be admitted that it proceeds from some law governing life. The Good therefore consists not only in what leads to the pleasure of self-conservation, but also in what leads to the pleasure of self-improvement and the improvement of the whole species. The striving of the individual and his pains may end in his death, but it leads to higher life. He helps in the evolution of the higher life. Does he do so as a passive instrument of the dread power Nature or is he an active determining factor? It is clear that dead Nature cannot determine progress. It is life indeed, the individual living being, that determines progress. He does so by a law of his being. It is compliance with this law of his being, as well as with the law of self-preservation, that leads to the Good.

Let us go to the biologists rationalists, scientists and philosophers, whose opinions about the evolution of the faculties of reason, described before in Chapter IV, have obliged all fair-minded men to recast their inherited ideas about morality.

The origin and development of the social instinct and the moral sense in man is thus very vividly described by Mr. Hook in his recent book mentioned before.

"The first man was not tortured with religious difficulties. He was capable of little more than instinctive action. His whole life was dominated by

those primal instincts that had marked his predecessors, self-maintenance, acquisition of food, avoidance of danger and the exercise of his sexual functions. It was an age of individualism in all its naked simplicity. We may imagine that wretched forerunner of our race wandering through the dense forests or over the rolling plains. Naked and homeless he dragged with him the female and such offspring as managed to survive their hard condition. Many dangers surrounded him in the shape of huge beasts and reptiles as bent on the search for food as himself on his. Between him and his fellow humans there existed no feeling but indifference in times of satiety and fear and hatred in time of want, and the deep-rooted suspicion and distrust of foreigners, that so marked a feature of the race to-day, is a legacy of those distant times. Family affection as between the parents and their mature offspring was of a negative character and went no further than mutual tolerance. No positive bond, no sense of duty, no impulse to self-sacrifice yet existed." He then describes how "in the case of our primitive man the neighbourhood of others growing from an occasional incident to an habitual condition became embodied in the character of the individual." As man grew in numbers, improved security tended to diminish the wandering habit and families became more or less attached to certain districts, and such places came in time to be inhabited by people connected by blood or by long association. From mere tototation of neighbours evolved the social instinct. We now come to the stage when men lived as members of a group

or society. Man "now lived in constant intercourse with his fellows and his own well-being became more and more intimately connected with theirs. In most ways their circumstances were so similar that good fortune and ill fortune came to them in common. Injury to him generally accompanied injury to them, even when this was not the case, security was at least disturbed by any thing that attacked or destroyed the security of his neighbour. In course of time the conception of injury to the one became inseparable from that injury to the others. As the experiences themselves had been closely associated, so their mental impressions became united, until the observation of hurt suffered by another individual recalled the impression of hurt to the man himself; and so created in the mind of the man an inclination or desire to remove the cause of the trouble". Thus originated sympathy, which according to Mr. Hook "was a secondary quality in the human organism evolved in the same way as other secondary qualities" "With the social instinct is intimately connected the conception of right and wrong. As the word indicates, morality is a system of "habit", a code of conduct. In its earlier stages it related to those elementary self-restraints without which the most primitive society could not exist. The unwarranted aggressions of one on the property of another was soon followed by more or less definite punishment. In time instinct led the individual to avoid offences which had been uniformly punished; and this habitual distinction between acts punished and acts that were

not, marked the appearance of the primitive conscience. Property was consequently the first sphere of this primitive practice of right and wrong. The development of the mental powers of man, the increasing complexity of his relations with his fellows, the growth of the social instinct, have made of conscience a more delicate machine, and have brought within its sphere a great variety of actions and even thought. It has outstripped the written law in many cases, embracing habits and traditional customs, which not only vary widely in different nations but exhibit not a little diversity in the various localities and classes of each separate country. The moral sense in all its infinite variety sprang from the simple root above described. We see that it is indirectly related to the actual written law of the country and in no sense connected with the religion of the people. We shall find indeed that its influence in shaping religion has been much greater than the converse action of religion in forming and directing the moral life of the people."

"To refrain from inflicting injury upon another is not of necessity the result of a moral perception. It is more commonly and in the earlier stages of human progress, entirely, the outcome of a purely individualist instinct to avoid any thing which involves injury to oneself. The animal ancestors of man were purely self-regarding organisms. Their whole activities were directed and governed as their own preservation demanded. "Right" and "wrong" at such a period had no existence. Right and wrong

(as such) imply the judgment of conduct by reference to some ideal ; and the sense of wrong is but the consciousness that a particular action is not in accordance with the ideal which the individual concerned recognises as the most worthy. We shall find that the ideal is, like all other human secondary characters, the outcome of habit and consciousness. The earliest human society necessitated as the condition of its existence that its members should exercise a mutual forbearance, that they should not readily attack each other or take those primitive articles, which each had made." This habit, it is said, became "ingrained in the functional memory of the individuals" and an instinct, "an actual part of the man, the forerunner of the moral sense." "The violation of an instinct causes a feeling of discomfort" and "in later times when the more developed mind could connect in conscious thought the action and the subsequent distress, the action came to be regarded as wrong, meaning that it was followed by undesirable sensations.

As the habit of mutual tolerance preceded the determination of disputes by an outside party, so the moral sense is of older growth than the institution of justice. It covered for similar reason a much wider field. Representing as it does the accumulated experience of the past, it is not surprising that we find now a days that the rules of morality are at times inconsistent with the laws of a country, the rules of justice, which represent not so much the conditions that have been as the conditions which

the governing authority thinks desirable at the present moment."

Mr. Hook having like other biologists traced the moral sense to habit and functional memory, thus describes its development: "the development of the mental powers of man, the increasing complexity of his relations with his fellows, the growth of the social instinct, have made of conscience a more delicate machine, and have brought within its sphere, a great variety of actions and thought. * * The moral sense in all its infinite variety sprang from the simple root above described. We see that it only indirectly related to the actual written law of the society and in no sense connected with the religion of the people. We shall find that its influence in shaping religion has been much greater than the converse action of religion in forming and directing the moral life of the people."*

The author then describes how in the beginning morality respected the rights of men of equal class in regard to property or wives and was different in the treatment of inferior classes. "The power which the chiefs had long enjoyed of taking to themselves the goods and chattels (including the wives and daughters) of their inferiors found a place in the moral habits of the race." Public opinion sanctioned conduct in the nobles and priests in respect to the lower classes which was not allowed in men of equal class. This "state of morality has not yet disappeared from western nations" and, the

*Humanity and its Problems by Alfred Hook Chapter p p. 118-121.

author might have added, may be found in the laws of Manu which are yet in force in India. The author next describes how the laws of morality applied only among members of the same community and foreign communities were objects of indifference and often of hate. We find as a consequence that in wars among nations, violation of all the ten commandments is even at the present moment considered, good and virtuous even by the most devout Christian priests.

The above long quotation is made as it very succinctly and vividly describes the position of the modern rationalist. That there is great truth in it will be recognized by all impartial men. But it ignores the most important part of life and the most important element in ethics as we shall presently see.

The moral sense, though it may have the base origin as described above, is every day assuming such glorious form that it is becoming increasingly difficult to conceive that it had such origin and it will ultimately assume a spiritual form, which it will be impossible even to imagine to have ever had any connection with matter or any thing impure or ignoble. That is the great mystery of this life of ours. The process of the evolution of goodness in life is infinitely more glorious than the mean ideal of our impure so called conscience being regarded as the voice of God speaking to man and which has been always appealed to by religious teachers as the command of God, specially conveyed to them, whenever they wished to attain some selfish object by wrong and immoral means. The right

Conscience.

never required for its sanction such mysterious commands. Thus religious men have every reason to be thankful to the materialist for purifying ethics. The materialist commits the grave mistake of being satisfied with tracing morality back to its original ignoble forms and ignores the process by which morality is becoming nobler and nobler every day, by which base metal is being transmuted into gold, and matter is becoming spirit.

Let us further consider the matter in the light of facts of human history. Ethical rules are based upon a feeling of obligation in men in general to conform to them. Some philosophers call this, which obliges, conscience, some moral sense, some common sense and some call it reason. The most acute of them say the 'ought' and the 'right' define themselves and require no definition. Indeed, these are word-creations of noble acute minds, like heaven, hell and the like, which do not correspond with any verities. Positive philosophy however, considers ethics in the light of true history and facts of Nature and not as ideas flowing from certain words, of the reality of which there is not any tangible proof.

History of
moral rules.

Certain facts seem clear : (1) There can be no ethics for a solitary man ; (2) the desire to retain the fellowship of others is a permanent motive power in man and there is no greater punishment than ostracism or banishment for life ; (3) kings and governments are regarded as authorities, which can lay down rules of conduct for a man and can demand his

submission to them, even at the sacrifice of his own life.

When man was practically indistinguishable from the anthropoid ape the male would try to kill all the other males, even its own offspring, and be surrounded by a herd of females. The females preserved their young male offspring. Greater intelligence helped to preserve the young male against the stronger male leader to a greater extent than among apes. Greater reason led men to give up the habit of solitary life and to settle in families and small communities, for they found self-preservation impossible without the co-operation and help of their fellows, and males came to be more valued than females. Restraint upon the unbridled indulgence of the passions was a consequence flowing directly from the necessity of living as members of communities.

Morality was evolved with families and communities. It was found that if a person did not wish to be shunned and ostracised by his fellows, he must regulate his conduct in such a manner as might not be utterly disagreeable to them. If he, like a mad man ran amock with a knife striking at every body around him, or if his fellows found that he was always devising means to put them into bodily pain or death, they had to kill him or to shun him. Similarly, if they found that he was always trying to deprive them of the fruits of their toil openly by force or secretly by fraud, they had to kill him or to ostracise him. If again they found that he was always trying to violate their women openly or to seduce them se

cretly, they would either kill him or shun his company. The three great rules or morality do not require any mysterious obligatory power inherent in themselves. The fellows of a man, whom he can not do without, enforce these rules either by shunning his company or by killing him or reducing him to the condition of a slave, as they did in ancient times.* In the early stages of society when a community consisted, say of a dozen individuals, a man by the imperative rule of self-preservation had to practice the negative virtues enjoined by the commandments, commit no murder, commit no robbery or theft, commit no rape and also the positive virtue of standing by your fellows against wild beasts and wilder men and of trying to further the welfare of the brotherhood. The sanction for enforcing such moral conduct was terrible. The man who would make himself obnoxious to his small community by committing murder, bodily harm, robbery, theft and rape would either be killed or be cast out by his brethren impelled by the motive of self-preservation and would die a solitary miserable death in the desert or be devoured in the awful primæval forests by wild beasts. These elementary rules of conduct by the tradition of generations acquired the character of habits and were subsequently regarded as moral laws and their reasonableness and obligatory character were instinctively recognized by man. Philosophers called such natural recognition conscience, moral

* We find in ancient law death was the punishment for theft and most crimes. Reduction to slavery was in time substituted for it and later imprisonment. If the offender was strong, the weaker members combined to kill him or to fly from him and thus ostracize him.

consciousness and other mysterious faculties found by them to exist in the human soul. When communities became large, rules were framed by them and punishment was prescribed in the modern methods for the enforcement of the above elementary duties of its members. Laws were next made by the ruling authority and enforced by temporal sanction. Long submission to such laws became a habit and habit in time became an instinct, which was denominated moral sense or conscience. It is not necessary to go to mysterious authorities and to still more mysterious reasons to explain why a person is constrained to conform to the above moral rules. It should be mentioned here however, as Mr. Hood has rightly pointed out, that the moral instinct preceded human laws which are found in time lagging behind the development of the moral sense consequent on the development of the mental powers of man. The fact only shows that the ethical ideas of man are changing and progressive and not that they do not exist at all.

The altruistic conduct of sacrificing one's wealth, pleasure and even life for pleasing his fellow-castemen, fellow-citizens, co-religionists or fellow-countrymen is easily explained by the obvious cause that one wishes to be agreeable to his fellows and to get their approbation and also self-satisfaction proceeding from the instinct acquired as mentioned before. If you stand by and calmly see your brother murdered by a stronger man or beast without attempting to help him and thus risking your own safety, do you think your

fellow-men will associate with you? Governments may in time make laws for punishing criminally men guilty of such conduct, like men guilty of murder or robbery. Here again the motive power is clear and we need not go to mysterious causes.

History of
self-sacrifice

Speaking of sacrifice, a chapter of ancient human history now nearly forgotten must be remembered. The earliest record of human society shows that it consisted of kings and their slaves. Kings, nobles and slaves were the old state. Nobles considered themselves theoretically as slaves of the king, to whom they owed allegiance and who could command their swords and their life. As regards the slaves, they were regarded as chattels of their masters and were under the duty of sacrificing their lives, if necessary, for them. Philosophers, who write learned and mysterious dissertations on *duty* and *right*, should know that the first duty that history tells us man owed was that of the noble to his king and of the slave to his master. There was sacrifice every where. Men were sacrificed to please blood-thirsty gods for securing good crops and for being sent to the other world to serve their dead masters there. Women burnt and buried themselves with their dead lords for their pleasure in the other world. This murder of shrieking victims became the custom of all countries. Submission to it for a thousand generations made readiness to be willing sacrifices the highest of all virtues. Shrieking and struggling women and slaves were originally stabbed to death or forced to immolate themselves for serving

their dead lords in the other world. By the habit of generations they came to the frame of mind of sacrificing their lives willingly. History tells us that even hundreds of young girls gaily decked went with joy and pride, in magnificent processions, with song and music, to be burnt with old decrepit kings and princes who were their nominal husbands*. Such women were acclaimed as saints. Even now, widows burn themselves in India, notwithstanding the laws of the British, and are regarded as divine beings. Men also got the habit, which became second nature with them, of sacrificing themselves for their masters. Even in the year 1913 the great Marshal Nogi, the foremost captain of his time, committed suicide according to custom to accompany his dead master, the Emperor of Japan, in the other world. All this is magnificent and uncommonly noble. But it should not be forgotten that what was cruel murder of the weak and the helpless by force of habit has come to be considered by the victim as the noblest of sacrifices to be willingly and joyfully submitted to. The noblest of self-sacrifice by men and women has thus been developed. Self-sacrifice has become a noble habit with man. In the last and the greatest of all wars, millions of men willingly sacrificed themselves for their King, Czar, Kaiser or Nation. Millions of slaves did the same before them. But now the descendants of those slaves, are the noblest of free men, who think nothing

* Several young girls of 16 were burnt in the nineteenth century with Ranjit Singh. European travellers on the 16th and 17th centuries saw in certain cases as many as 1300 wives and concubines burning themselves with their dead lords.

of sacrificing their lives, out of noble motives in which there is no trace of compulsion in which they originated.

Development
of ideas of the
good.

Let us consider further how the idea of the good has developed. The old theory of Hindus and Christians is that man was perfect at the beginning of creation. The Satya Yuga—the period of Truth, the golden age—the age of Adam before his fall—is the ideal of man. All virtue and all goodness existed in those ancient times. Modern man has fallen from that high estate of his ancestors. History and philosophy have demonstrated this idea as an absolute myth, a pleasant phantasy. It has also an unpleasant side to it. All fanatics and priests desirous of retaining their emoluments, and privileges jealously guard their dogmas and privileges on the ground of infallible authority of ancient books, which they assert contain truth and virtue undefiled. The most cruel and mischievous practices, such as the burning of widows, have been supported on the ground of the absolutely good “primæval custom.” Modern science and philosophy can only smile at such fantastic claims.

History of man tells us that at the beginning man was a very imperfect and immoral animal. Falsehood, theft, robbery, unchastity, murder and all the other great sins and vices were regarded as virtues and accomplishments. History and the facts of the evolution of the species are no respecters even of the accepted rules of ethics. What we consider great vices were absolutely neces-

ssary for the evolution of the higher species and thus could not be considered unmoral at the time.

Let us take the worst of all crimes, namely murder. Without the cruel process of destruction of the weaker by the stonger, nature could not have evolved the glorious forms of life we now see. Killing has been considered a great virtue in all times even up to the present day. The great heroes of ancient and modern times, the Alexanders, Cæzars, Napoleons, Washingtons, Wellingtons, Tamerlanes, Moltkes and Hindenburgs, man has worshipped as semi-divine. Have we not seen the spectacle of the most pious Christian divines, during the last great war, extolling war and killing as the acme of virtue and invoking even the authority of the gentle Jesus to support their positions? The fact remains killing is not immoral and indeed must be considered as moral at certain stages of evolution, and ethics must modify its dogmatic dictum based on the commandment supposed to have been received by Moses from God Himself "thou shalt commit no murder." Neither Buddha's principal doctrine of eschewing killing in all its forms nor the teaching of the gentle Jiesus were good, when all in Nature were fighting in the relentless struggle for the survival of the fittest, the struggle, out of which all glorious science and noble ideas have been evolved. Parents deserted and destroyed their offspring. Sons killed their old parents. Primitive life depended on cruelty and killing. Gentleness and love were foreign to its nature and antagonistic to its

existence. Mercy and love have been evolved out of cruelty and murder, like sight in blind organisms. The Hindus with a surprising spiritual insight described the God of destruction as the Siva or the Good.

I take another instance. What is more patent to the conscience as evil than falsehood and deceit? The moral philosopher says that conscience directly points to them as evil. But it is not a fact of nature that deceit was always evil, whatever the dogmatic conscience of the philosophers may say. Deceit preserved the life of animate nature and beautified it. Deceit has been the weapon with which the weak have preserved themselves from the strong. It is deceit which has given the beautiful colours of birds, butterflies and other animals. The weak were protected not by the strong and the good but by deceit, which must be considered therefore as blessed. Even the strong owe their beautiful colours to deceit, for without it, they could not secure the prey, which provided them with food. Equally like strength, deceit has been a power that has preserved life. Even in the higher affairs of man, called politics, and in wars in the twentieth century, strength and deceit are both indispensable. Both stand on the same footing and must be declared as not evil. Tooth and fangs, fleetness of foot and the power of deception were all good at the time. It is nevertheless true that truth is noble and falsehood is the contrary of it. But even truth, as opposed to falsehood, had no place in the constitution of the organization of animals at the beginning. As non-sight is not evil, so deceit is not evil; but truth is good, falsehood is not.

Let us consider the idea of truth further. We know that the primitive man had no idea of truth. Falsehood and deceit were necessary to him for the preservation of life and were considered by him to be great virtues. The new-born babe and the boy have no idea of truth and most men are ignorant of it until they are taught its excellence by society. It is only orderly society that made falsehood and deceit unnecessary for the preservation of life, and not till truth among the members of a society became indispensable for the existence of society, did the idea of truth come to be entertained. Even now truth is regarded good in dealings among friends. Among warring nations, falsehood, deceit and espionage are regarded as heroic virtues by the nations in whose favour they are used by their nationals and equally regarded with horror and ruthlessly punished by their enemy nations against whom they are employed. But the idea of truth has nevertheless been growing. Every man considers that standard of truth to be good which is approved by his neighbours and which ensures his safety and prosperity. Religious fanatics believing in the worst of superstitions have often sacrificed their own lives and more frequently burned and crucified those that dissented from them by thousands, for the sake of what they asserted was truth but which in reality was gross and mischievous falsehood, because it was considered to be the truth by their neighbours. The history of the freedom of thought among men shows with what great difficulties truth has had to contend. Further, we

always have a reservation in our mind and language in speaking the truth. The famous righteous king Yudisthira of the Mahabharata was advised by the divine Krishna to tell Drona his preceptor that his son Asvatthama was dead and to add that the said Asvatthama was an elephant of the same name, in inaudible voice. Whenever truth and self-interest clash many good men are satisfied with verbal truth. How the ideas of truth and honesty have been becoming finer and nobler will appear from the recent judgments of the courts of civilized countries dealing with cases about transactions with and by brokers, partners, agents, managers and trustees. Lawyers know that the verbal truth, which was considered very moral a century ago and with which many still satisfy their consciences, is often gross deceit. Rationalists again rightly say that philosophers, who defend religious superstitions by finding plausible reasons for them or by inventing meanings or untenable dogmas, are guilty of great transgression of truth. Thus have ideas about truth been growing. The idea of truth is indeed every day assuming nobler forms.

Honesty.

The investigators of the early history of man have shown that in the beginning there was no idea of property. Honesty as a virtue was unknown among primitive men. Dishonesty, cunning, theft, and murder were certainly virtues, which led to the survival of the fittest. From this evolved the noble idea of honesty as laid down in the Veda and in the Mosaic Law. But that old idea of honesty is now often found to be

deficient. The idea of honesty is every day becoming nobler and truer, as lawyers know.

Where was chastity in the beginning of Life ? Promiscuity was the rule and was indispensable for the preservation of life. Even now, chastity as understood by high class Hindus, is not intelligible to Christians and Mahomedans or even to the Nairs among Hindus. There was no chastity at the beginning. It too has been evolved out of unchastity, which was at a time considered good and lucky in women. Herbert Spencer thus speaks of chastity : "Virginity in a wife was a mark of bad luck. Women who were chaste were considered miserable by themselves, by their husbands and by their neighbours. Complete promiscuity has been held by some authors as not simply the practice, but in some sort, the law among primitive men." From this in time arose the noble chastity of the Hindu Sati and also the idea of chastity of the canonical law. The Hindu idea of chastity must however be given up as cruel tyranny. Even the European idea of chastity which entitles a man to kill the offspring of unmarried and thus unholy connection, must also be given up as not good but evil. The idea of chastity is still very undeveloped. It will develop into finer and finer forms.

Chastity
considered.

Take next justice, upon which Plato based ethics. Could he define it ? Most people are disagreed as to what is absolute justice. The socialists have shown that the old ideas of justice are unjust. It has been observed by an acute writer that the old Greek and Roman philosophers enunciated philo-

Justice.

sophy for a superior class, who had slaves to work for them. Their philosophies did not apply to slaves. Newer and truer ideas of justice are being evolved, in the light of which all old ideas of it must be discarded as unjust and evil.

What we call virtue has thus been evolved out of what we now regard as wicked and evil. The proposition will appear at first sight to be paradoxical but it follows from the facts mentioned above. Further, it is established by modern science. Lombroso's theories about criminality, based upon the experiments and life-long labours of a great scientist, have established that certain peculiar brain-formations and glands accompany criminal propensities, and that cruel beasts and habitual human murderers have certain physical characteristics in common. Thieving propensities are similarly accompanied with peculiar physical characteristics. When the instinct to kill and to thief for food prevailed in the animal world as a necessity of life, it was because the animal by the constitution of its body could have no better propensities. Moral qualities could not exist as long as the constitution of the body was not changed. The evolution of honesty, mercy and justice required the elimination of those peculiar physical characteristics and the evolution of other characteristics. Physical facts and laws can not be abolished by philosophic speculations. The investigation of the process of the evolution and development of the sense-organs of self-consciousness, of the reasoning faculty as well as of the ethical faculty

is the most fascinating study in modern science.* We have seen before that the phenomenon is incompatible with pure materialism. How the good has been evolved out of the non-good is a mystery which must baffle the materialist. The philosopher who doubts the existence of the good God, because of the existence of what he calls evil, is effectually answered by the facts of science. He ignores realities in his pride of the infallibility of ideas about goodness and in the arrogant assertion that his ideas are dictated by conscience or the voice of God. But what the philosophers, who preceded him, considered as good, he now considers evil. What he considers good may however be considered evil by his successors in the chair of dogmatic proud moral philosophy.

Further the history of the origin and development of some of the active virtues described below clearly shows the truth of the above position.

The sentiment of love is made much of by poets, ^{Growth of love.} philosophers and religious men. It is a noble sentiment upon which the world of life is based. But what is it? It is based on the instinct of the propagation of the species. The first manifestation of it is the sexual exercise of the savage, the gross and ignoble character of which has been described before. The next higher manifestation of it is the maternal instinct in all living beings. It is the outcome of the desire to protect the living being in its helplessness.

* Lombroso's theories have not received wide acceptance. But recent discoveries of thought-centres and thought-ducts lend support to the proposition that certain physical characteristics were common to ferocious predatory beasts as well as men in primitive stages. Those characteristics have since been eliminated to a great extent in the case of man by disuse.

which proceeds from a law of nature for the preservation of life. It is strongest when the newborn animal is utterly helpless and the mother is oblivious even of her own existence in her anxiety for her young. It becomes weaker and weaker as the animal grows older and stronger, till in the case of the lower animals it entirely disappears and there arises rivalry and enmity between the male parent and his progeny for the possession of his females. Among savage races of men in Africa this state of things is sometimes found. But among civilized men, by reason of the long time required for the education of youth, when they are dependent on their parents, and consequent prolonged association and by reason of the development of the family system by which old parents become dependent on their children and by the growth of spiritual life which overrides the law of nature called the survival of the fittest which eliminates the weak and the helpless and makes the savage man to destroy his helpless aged parents, the love of the parents is prolonged and is reciprocated. What a fine shape has love between man and woman, parents and children and brothers and sister assumed! It is difficult to conceive how it arose out of the loveless heart of the primitive man. The love of brothers is a result of long association and the need of mutual protection. But it did not exist in primitive ages. The tragic story of Cain and Abel was then of every day occurrence. As regards friendship, of which much is made of by poets and philosophers and which is described

by David in his lamentation over Jonathan in the beautiful words oft-quoted, "very pleasant hast thou been unto me, thy love for me was wonderful, passing the love of women", it did not exist in the heart of primitive man, who looked upon every other man with suspicion and hatred.

There are wise and good men who make light of love. The worthlessness of love between friends, brothers and lovers is the theme of philosophers and poets of many countries. Love of woman is proverbially fickle. As regards the noble foundship described by David, it is pointed out that David with his six hundred men had long joined the Phillistines and was with them three days before the battle in which Saul and Jonathan were killed and did not participate in the fight because the Phillistines did not trust them and sent them away, and they went and fought the Amalekites. All this only proves that there is great truth in the position that all virtues originated from self-love.

Without doubt self-love was originally predominant and even now has not lost its supremacy in the heart of man. But the existence of self-effacing love can not be denied, notwithstanding the doubts of cynics. It is marvellous to contemplate how from very ignoble origin, which was practically the negation of love as understood now, has sprung the fine flower of love between friends, brothers and sisters, parents and children, and between lovers of different sexes. This love is still gross and material but it is growing finer and more spiritual.

Mercy.

Let us consider the origin and growth of mercy. There was no mercy in nature in the beginning, as Huxley justly points out. Cruelty reigned supreme. Man has been slowly outgrowing his primitive material instincts. They were necessary in his primitive condition, when he was weak and at the mercy of the mighty beasts that surrounded him and of inclement nature. He has overcome all that and has outgrown that state. It was out of the suffering he saw others experiencing and which he himself often experienced from cruel acts, in which he himself revelled, whenever he could, that mercy sprang forth. Strange as it may appear, mercy arose out of cruelty. The strong man snatched away a boy clinging to his father, a girl from the bosom of her shrieking mother or a young woman from her agonized mate. The oppressed would do the same towards his weaker neighbour. But the father, the mother and the husband, who experienced the edge of the sword, experienced also the keener edge of the parting with the son, the daughter and the wife. The spear thrust into a shrieking son's breast was felt as a spear thrust into his own breast. Man's heart was dull and material, hard cruel strokes, exquisitely keen thrusts of the sword-blade were necessary to arouse its feelings. With great labour and trouble and suffering were wives, sons and daughters, obtained, fed and protected and the keenness of parting with these dearly obtained members of one's household was made thousand times keener to man by the unfeeling cruel conduct of his stronger

and luckier neighbour and rival. What idea can man or woman in these civilized times have of the feelings of his or her primitive ancestor? There was no mercy in the beginning. Mercy had its origin in this cruel process—in this suffering of the all but mere animal, which man was at the time. Just fancy, mercy and love growing out of blood-thirstiness and suffering and the oppressing by the stronger of the weaker, out of the delight of the strong in the exercise of his power, out of his 'pleasure in overcoming resistance of the struggling weak'! Strenuous endeavour and keen suffering have been the cause of all progress in the world of the living. The power and cruelty of the strong only produced the endeavour and the pain. Beasts of prey, the stronger neighbour, the cruel forces of nature, all contributed to the result. Goodness, mercy and love may have their origin in self-love but they have assumed the glorious form, of which self-sacrifice is the essential characteristic. Strenuous effort and keen suffering still exist and shall probably exist for all time as the direct cause of the evolution of noble and still nobler forms, faculties and of higher feelings.

Out of the self-regarding, self-preserving instinct is growing the self-sacrificing spirit of mercy towards others. If rational beings then find that only they are merciful, but Nature is not and can not be resisted and that there is no Father for all over nature, they will surely checkmate Nature and destroy all life as Buddha attempted to do. But surely they may find that self-disregarding mercy, proceeds

from supernatural sources. It proceeds from reason, the philosophers would say. Reason, weakness and the social instinct will not however, wholly explain it. Mercy is not found in Nature. It is outside Nature. It is growing and growing. It is the quality of an individual. It becomes increasingly manifest in the actions of communities and states, as a consequence of its growth in the individual mind. It did not owe its origin to communities, society, governments and the like, which can not admit considerations of mercy to the individual, when the common good or safety is concerned, and which aim at the elimination of the weak and the diseased. To whom are the weak and the lowly to turn? Is there a Person, an Individual, above all Nature and above society, above all living beings, who is the source of this virtue—is there a Person to whose abounding mercy the living universe may rely? If there is none, life's value is difficult to see.

There are philosophers, who say that mercy is no virtue. It is only the badge of the weak. It is the instrument by which the weak protect themselves from the strong, who are deluded by the majority who are weak, in believing it to be a virtue. No doubt mercy is intended for the weak. But who are there in this universe, gods, angels, men or other organisms, who are not weak and who do not end in utter misery? It is the consciousness of the common miserable lot that makes all living beings to cry for mercy and to exercise it. In course of time

as reason and clear apprehension of the common good will develop more, mercy will be the guiding principle of the rational being. Further, it has been shown before how there would be no crying for mercy and no mercy, if the cry for mercy were not answered. Buddha would not cry for mercy himself as not required for him. Nietzsche's strong man likewise, would not cry for mercy. Notwithstanding Buddha, the Stoics and Nietzsche, this frame of mind is not natural. What is true is that notwithstanding strong cruel Nature and the strong-minded philosophers, mercy towards others is growing.

Some biologists assert that mercy is an emotion which is the result of affections on weak nerves produced by pitiful sights and cries. This was true of the primitive man. Again the feeling of contemptuous pity felt by the strong oppressor towards the weeping supplicating weak was at one time the only form of mercy known. But from it has evolved the glorious form of mercy in which contemptuous pity has no part. True mercy is not an emotion proceeding from weak nerves. Indeed, the old Hindu philosopher rightly says that the weak are merciless. True mercy is a quality of strength in which there is no contemptuous pity. It did not exist at the beginning. It has been growing in the heart of man by an inscrutable process. Mercy has slowly been assuming a very noble form. It will become noble and nobler and the whole universe of rational living beings will soon feel it as the governing passion.

Asceticism.

Let us take what is considered the noblest of virtues, namely asceticism. In ancient times, it was the practice to kill very old parents or to make them commit suicide by throwing themselves from heights or by drowning themselves in sacred rivers. Even now among certain savage tribes in North East India, aged parents are cast down from house-tops and killed. Some eminent European scholars have interpreted a text of the Rig Veda (1 M. 10S.5) as evidencing the practice of murdering aged parents. The interpretation is probably wrong. But these scholars are right when they say that such was the ancient Teutonic custom and that it probably existed among ancient Indo-Aryans. However that may be, in the Rig Veda and the oldest of Hindu Law books, we find that sons were regarded as co-owners of the family property with the father and entitled to take the management of it from his hands when he became old. It was enjoined as a positive rule of conduct that in old age persons should retire to the forest leaving their family and home and become ascetics and end their lives in desirelessness and contemplation. Desirelessness and ascetism were not allowable except to old men. It was Buddha who enjoined asceticism to all adult persons. Sankara followed him long after and established, after a famous controversy with upholders of the old law that a person could be an ascetic whenever he was convinced of its nobleness. It is a fact of history that asceticism originated in India. Christian monks and nuns and ascetic religious enthusiasts are the direct outcome of the Buddhist practice, which again origina-

ted in the old Aryan practices mentioned above. The very noblest and purest saintliness has thus come into existence as a development of not very noble practices. Reason might point out the expediency of the forced or willing retirement of the aged to forests and the goodness their conduct, but it would find it hard to explain how the glories of philosophic asceticism arose out of it. These are results which absolutely stun and bewilder the mind.

Let us go to charity. The history of the virtue of charity shows how in all countries the idea of it has grown. In its popular sense it meant eleemosynary acts. The laws originally defined charitable bequests as bequests for religious purposes and for giving alms. Giving doles to the poor by the rich who expected to sup with Abraham on the strength of such ostentatious charity, and making gifts to Brahman priests, Buddhist Bhikkus or to Christian clergy and establishments was considered and is even now considered as the greatest of virtuous acts, which entitle a person to a place in heaven after death. But socialism will have nothing of such charity. The old and the infirm, the cripple and one unable to earn his living must be supported by the State and not by the proud rich.

Charity.

The word charity has been slowly extended from giving alms and making religious gifts to all good acts. It is understood to mean forgiveness or toleration of the wrong or injurious actions of others and bearing the infirmities of the weak as well as of

the sinful. In its most extended sense now known to us, it becomes the undefined noble sentiment spoken of by St. Paul in his beautiful and ever to be remembered epistle, in which charity is described as that "which thinketh no evil" and "rejoiceth not in iniquity, which "suffereth long and is kind", "envieth not", "vaunteth not" "is not, easily provoked", "beareth all things", "endureth all things" and "asketh not her own", and which is greater than feeding the poor, knowledge, spiritual gifts of a prophet and the sacrifice for religion by a martyr which "gives the body to be burned." The definition is very similar to that of Dharma by Buddha. Thus has the idea of charity developed and it will assume still finer forms.

Other virtues.

Take other ideas of virtue. Do unto others as you would others do unto you is a rule of conduct which was enunciated only two thousand years ago as a basis of ethics. It was laid down by Christ, as well as by Buddha. Since then the idea has been developing and colouring human conduct in all departments of life. Honour is an idea, which has come into existence in modern times and is every day developing into finer shapes. Honour was at first defined as the praise of society and dishonour as blame from neighbours. Jesus showed that he whom all men praised was not good, and he whom his neighbours hated and spoke ill of, openly derided as a lunatic and even poisoned and crucified, as they did Socrates and Jesus, might be the very best of all mankind. Now the same honour has attained a very delicate and fine form, independent of praise or blame of neighbours. This honour will in

Honor.

future give the motive power to women to be faithful to their husbands, to men to abstain from falsehood and deceit and to heroes to sacrifice their lives. But honour may in time prove to be an artificial motive based on secret pride and give way to a higher and nobler motive power. Goodness is shining over this universe and illumining it with a light inexpressibly beautiful. What noble ethical ideas, what beautiful flowers of moral conduct, what clear whiteness of purity, what grandeur of sacrifice, it will produce, the mind of man can not conceive. We only judge from the past and wonder and throw ourselves on the dust and praise the Good One, the Lord of Life and the merciful Father for this wonderful manifestation in life.

Let us now consider some of the speculations of philosophers and scientists about the origin of ethics.

Materi:lists and hedonistic moral philosophers agree in holding that morality and goodness and mercy proceeded from self-love. Let us now consider whether these can wholly explain the great fact in life of the evolution of the higher and still higher goodness. Bain says : " We are able to conceive the pains of other beings by our experience of the like by us and whenever we do so conceive them we are urged to the same steps of alleviation as if the pains were ours." There is an element of truth in this position and it is true that morality, sympathy and mercy were originally based on self-regard and are even now but little better but surely goodness

whether
ethics is iden-
tical with self-
love.

and mercy exist apart from self-love. How self-sacrifice can be evolved, as it is surely being evolved, out of self-love is a mystery which must baffle the materialist and the hedonist.

Hobbes says that morality is rational self-love and goes further and says reason is only the instinct of the organism to preserve its existence. He then proceeds to show that the present rules of ethics are the natural result of the social instinct and of the necessities of a social life.

Social laws
and supposed
higher reason
of communi-
ties.

There are again some who allow to society or state a reason higher than that of the individual. But the outcome of all these speculations is that morality is nothing more or less than the rules evolved by the natural instinct of self-love. But the instinct of self-preservation may lead to that which would help the continued existence of man in his present stage. It does not contemplate a higher life. The philosopher, who advocates the higher reason of society, comes to the rescue and says that it is secured by such higher reason. How can an assemblage of goats, for example, produce by social laws a rule of conduct for them which governs the monkeys, is difficult to conceive. An assembly can not produce a type higher than the highest individual among them. The question further arises how is the individual who is nobler than all his fellows produced? Where does he get the nobler life and the higher reason than is to be found in his species? The law of the evolution of the higher life cannot be explained by the instinct of self-preservation or

by social rules. It is the result of a law which includes rational self-love, the social instinct and something superior to both.

Again if there are only self-love and social laws and no goodness as apart from them, if all love is selfish and if all sympathy is social, and there is no mercy or love as apart from self-love and social sympathy, if there is only the self to be admired, cared for, contemplated and loved, as the Upanishada says, if love and sacrifice are based only on selfish instincts and enforced by social rules or penal laws of the state, life is surely very ignoble and absolutely not worth living. But fortunately it is not so.

The cannibal ancestor of man could not have devoured his fellowman, with genuine unalloyed delight, as he did, if sympathy the result of self-regarding instinct, were existing in his mind. Even if the self-regarding instinct, which philosophers call by various names, hedonism and the like, were the root of mercy and of all virtue, it surely was like "a few pigment grains of which the rudimentary eye consisted" according to Herbert Spencer. What acted upon it, as light acted upon those pigment grains to produce the glorious eye? What had the pigment grains to do with the glorious ideas of form, of art and of beauty? The roots of all glorious spiritual entities were surely in the protoplasm, but they were like those pigment grains producing ideas of highest beauty. Serpents, crocodiles and other low animals and even the domestic cat some-

times eat their own offspring. But history also tells us that mothers have willingly sacrificed their lives for their children. Baber, the great Mogul, prayed that his own life might be taken so that the life of his sick son Humayun might be spared and fully believed that his prayer was heard and died cheerfully. There was no social call, no desire for praise of fellow-beings. There was certainly the feeling that the son was his own son. But his own son was certainly not his own self. Has not the Upanishada declared that self is dearer than son or wealth? Surely love, which might have its origin in self-regard, proved itself more powerful than the self-regarding instinct, than self-love. The materialist would say that was temporary insanity. This insanity has grown out of the sanity of animals eating up their offspring. Were all martyrs insane? Were all doctors, who took the risk of making dangerous experiments upon themselves and died in consequence, insane or actuated by an improper and unreasonable, indeed insane desire of transitory posthumous fame? To be sure out of the self-regarding instinct, the self-sacrificing spiritual ethics has evolved. The law of self-conservation can not account for the progressive evolution of higher science, higher intelligence, nobler conduct or for pure mercy and love.

A new class of philosophers, led by Nietzche, has arisen who say that "every thing that increases the feeling of power, the will to power, power itself in man, is good, and happiness is the feeling that power is increasing, that resistance is being overcome." The

primal instinct of a living organism is to attack a weaker organism and to feed upon it. That was necessary for the preservation of the species. Pleasure certainly accrued from this exercise of power. Nature has made pleasure an accompaniment of every act necessary for the preservation and perpetuation of life. That original instinct has persisted. It led and is still leading to fighting for the possession of slaves and bond-women and the like. It is undoubtedly a source of great happiness. But it is the same instinct, which gives delight to a child killing ants, to a boy torturing birds or to an overgrown boy in the form of a Roman emperor or a Spanish grandee or an Eastern potentate revelling in gladiatorial fights, bull-fights, cock fights and the like. Nietzsche is however, right when he says that life and progress depended on power and cruelty at the beginning and does so to a large extent even now. These two are the basic ingredients of the life of organisms. The delight of a child in killing ants or of a boy in torturing birds is a survival of the original instinct. The cat not only kills the mouse but takes a great natural delight in torturing it, before eating it, by instinct. So do the tiger and the crocodile. So does every animal which kills for food. The sense of power over weaker organisms and the delight in torturing and killing them are thus the very foundation and the essential ingredient of life. At first all morality and pleas for mercy proceeded from the weak and the oppressed. The mighty men were not troubled by them. The Hindu Smritis therefore cynically say, speaking of the deeds of the

gods and of great men, that no fault attaches to persons of power. But out of that low morality has been evolved the noble morality, which is possible only in the case of persons of power and which is unaffected with any taint of fear or weakness. Nietzsche was not conscious of the spiritual fact that true ethics is based on strength and power and is more powerful than the power of the mightiest of evil men.

There are noble minds among scientists, who consider morality as a force superior to material forces. They say: "On this earth once huge reptiles, dinosaurs and theramorphs ruled supreme and oppressed the weaker animals and the mammalia preserved their feeble existence with difficulty by subterfuge and cunning. But the feeble ones have exterminated the strong ones by force of brains and morals, which formed society. In the long agony, fair dealing and mutual consideration have proved themselves to be surer grounds of social stability than force and illusion, charity and magnanimity, and common honesty have overcome the lust of the eye and the pride of life."* There is much truth in the above observations. The power of ethics is undoubted but it owes its power to reason and the social instinct and to a supreme law of life.

There are philosophers who consider that it was the morally nobler individuals who survived in the struggle for existence and that morality was thus developed. But they have little justification for their belief. History tells us that

*Read's Natural and Social Morals p. 262.

it was the most cunning and the most cruel, who survived and not the strongest or the most moral. The mammoths became extinct, the tiger became powerless before man's cunning. Cunning, deceit, cruelty and immoral force were the glories of the primitive man—the weapons with which he ruled. These constituted the greatness of the great men of past ages. It was their greater reason untrammelled by any moral scruples, that led them to such conduct.

Many modern philosophers have based morality solely on the social instinct, or what is called association, with much truth, as we have seen before. They say further, it is difficult to define "precisely where association ends and reason begins" in the evolution of ethics. The biologist says that reason and the social instinct are both developments of functional memory and of the faculty acquired of marshalling and comparing and generalizing complex sensual impressions. The materialistic philosopher finds it difficult to base morality entirely on association and says there is reason required in the process, though it is difficult to differentiate between the two. It is Reason that has proved itself superior to brute force. Reason found a moral life better adapted for the preservation and happiness of the individual and of the species than an immoral life, and enforced it on man. There are great philosophers who therefore, base ethics wholly on reason. No doubt reason can dominate matter and manipulate the forces of nature and bring her to subjection. The creative power however

Associations
and reason as
sources of
ethics.

* does not belong to it. It might force upon the community a conduct abstaining from murder by the sanction of the punishment of hanging, but it cannot produce the virtue of pity or mercy. There are philosophers however, who deny the existence of those virtues, apart from the nervous affections produced by habit. But they admit the supremacy and dominion of reason over Nature and her laws and the nervous affections. But what justification reason had for its conclusions about moral conduct from the existing facts and laws of nature? Reason surely could not advocate a conduct of honesty and meekness when murder and deceit were indispensable for the preservation of life. Reason would advocate the contrary conduct, as it did in Spartan society. It must be said that that acute writer, Kidd, in his *Social Evolution*, says rightly that 'reason is the most profoundly individualistic anti-social and anti-evolutionary of all human qualities'. Reason, which also according to the materialist is an effect of nervous affections, can not conceive nor inculcate a conduct, which is not conducive to the present conservation and pleasure of the organism but which leads to the good higher than what the reason of the organism is conscious of. It has further very recently been proved by a famous American educationist and experimental psychologist that the exercise and development of the intellect and the reasoning powers have little effect in reducing criminal propensities and often increase them. Reason is thus not sufficient for the evolution of ethics,

though notwithstanding the biologists and the psychologists, it must be admitted that it has a potent influence in it.

It must also be here mentioned, as described in chapter IV, that reasoning powers have been found invariably accompanied with certain thought-centres in the brain. Wicked impulses have also been found accompanied with certain physical characteristics distinct from the thought-organs. Thus ethics, science would say, is not the effect of reason. It is a faculty having its own peculiar organs evolving higher forms.

Again does ethics owe its origin to the old religious teachers and cults ?

We find in the dawn of civilization a class of men, who by the cultivation of reason and learning, and above all, magic, became a superior caste by working on the superstitious fears of their fellow-men. They accompanied the great military leaders as their advisers and priests, who claimed that by incantations and invocations of imaginary gods they could destroy their enemies and bring victory to their masters. These were the Atharvans of the Persians—the Brahmans of the Hindus—who accompanied the great king Sudasha of the Rigveda and the other conquering Aryan monarchs. They were also versed in all the arts of deceit and organization of men. There were such priests among Jews, who pretended to receive inspiration from the great Jahava and ruled over the kings. The present day priests and religious teachers are their direct descendants. It is through

them that ethics and religions have been developed. The noble modern religious ideas and rituals have sprung from their low incantations and exorcisms. It can not be said that pure ethics developed from these practices and grow as a full-grown tree grows from a sapling. It is different in character and kind and in its object. The object of all those ancient religious practices was the destruction of enemies and getting of slaves and women by fraud and force and magic. The growth of ethics and noble religious ideas is surely like the mysterious springing forth of the lotus from the mud, as the Sanscrit text says.

Does ethics
owe its origins
to Churches or
states.

Does ethics owes its force to churches, kings and states? We have seen how society and state have been the principal outward factors in the evolution of ethics. But if they were the most essential causes, morality would be stereotyped and mankind would have no higher ethics than of the time of Moses and Manu. As a matter of fact kings and states have made and unmade laws and religions, history tells us, according to the exigencies of statecraft or policy, for their own protection or aggrandizement. Even now, the claims of truth and mercy are inadmissible in politics. The great European war has shown that the noblest and the best among the most civilized nations of the earth consider falsehood, deceit, robbery, cruelty and cold-blooded murder as noble and necessary. Bishops and archbishops of civilized governments, as well as of the independent Churches, have dilated upon their

necessity and urged their flock to adopt them for the present. Even now, greatness consists in the power of excelling in cunning and force. It is not power or the sense of power which Nietzsche prescribes as the *Summum Bonum*, that has led to any results. The great ones of the earth even now rule by cunning and force and not by inherent power, whatever that may be. The great war has shown that what is necessary for the preservation of the species is even now such conduct as is wholly evil according to accepted ethical ideas. The ruling class practice deceit, robbery and murder, but punish their weaker brethren under penal laws for them and impress upon them the heinousness of immoral conduct. Certain courses of conduct, which we consider as immoral, are even now necessary in the public life of men in power, as well as in the private life of helpless poor weak men for keeping body and soul together.

We have described before how moral conduct was enjoined only upon the common people for keeping them obedient to kings and churches. It was regarded as an instrument to be employed by statesman and priests for their purposes. Philosophers with few exceptions helped the latter with subtle arguments. We know of the arguments of Macchiavelli and other philosophers about political matters. In religious matters also the philosophers supplied arguments for the prevailing dogmas. Even so late as the nineteenth century Baader said that 'every system of morals that is without a Saviour is

without salvation; fallen man has not the capacity to integrate himself; hereditary sin; the sin, of the Serpent hinders him in this'. It is said that even Kant and Hegel and other great orthodox Christian philosophers agreed with Baader. Philosophy has been a hand-maiden of the Church.

We can not therefore say that pure ethics owed its origin to Churches or States or philosophers.

Ethics did not exist at the beginning of life in animate nature. Scientists and other modern investigators can find no trace of ethics in nature. There is no room for it in the "vast driftings of cosmic matter." Nature is wholly unethical immoral, merciless, "red in teeth and claw with ravine" and is the realm of tiger rights, as Huxley rightly describes it. He rightly says that ethics is wholly inconsistent with the laws of nature, as "in place of ruthless self-assertion it demands self-restraint; in place of thrusting aside or treading down all competitors, it requires that the individual shall not merely respect but shall help his fellows". We know there was little difference between the primitive man and other highly developed animals, and the claims of religious and moral philosophers that intellect and morality belong exclusively to man, the only dearly loved creature of God, is now no longer tenable. There was no ethics in primitive life; where then did it come from?

Habit, social instinct, association, reason, self-love, state-laws and religious dogmas have all been

found insufficient by themselves to produce ethics. They have all contributed to the evolution of ethics. They have been instrumental in modifying the primitive murderous and predatory instincts, and the organs connected with these instincts have in time been modified by disuse enforced by custom, law and reason. New and finer organs have been evolved in the constitution of man, facilitating action and evolution of finer ethical ideas, as in the case of the reasoning faculties demonstrated by modern science. But all these causes singly or jointly could not produce purity and self-sacrifice which are the essence of morality.

To many scientists, the evolution of ethics, mercy and love in unethical cruel nature, the evolution in this unnatural world of ethics by natural man, is wholly inexplicable. Dr. Russell Wallace was driven to suppose some "influx from the unseen universe of spirit" to solve this difficulty. Dr. Wallace's position has been refuted by other scientists who rightly assert the existence of the ethical faculty in life. The existence of an influence outside nature however, can not be denied by science.

We can not know its nature, but we know, and it is enough for us to know, that an influence outside dead material remorseless nature, with her organisms destroying one another, exists, which has evolved ethics out of immorality, mercy out of cruelty, and that there is a relationship between the power exercising that influence and living beings and that that relationship evolves the good and the higher good, mercy and

greater mercy. Our inmost being responds to the call of the Good and even sacrifices itself for it.

But ethics is not wholly an influx from outside. Life has got the ethical faculty in its constitution, which is always growing. Ethics further has proceeded from certain natural causes, biology tells us.

Natural
causes of
the result.

We have seen before that there are four guiding principles of life : (1) the imperative impulse of self-preservation and its consequence, the desire of pleasure, which arises out of all that leads to it ; (2) the imperative desire and effort to be better and to evolve higher powers of life ; (3) the principle in life by, which out of low forms are evolved higher forms of life ; (4) the law by which life sacrifices itself for evolving the higher form. That is what biology teaches us. Philosophers also say the same thing. Tolstoy said, the sole purpose of life is to be better. Apart from the impulse of self-preservation and reproduction, the main principle governing life is to be better, to make the material surroundings better, to make other men better and indeed to bring into existence or to create things better than what are found to exist. If conservation of one's own being was all, the universe of life would be stationary. It is the other principles that evolve the higher form of life, through suffering, pain and death, which latter are all opposed to conservation of one's own being and its consequent pleasures. The fact most staggering to the materialist is this principle of evolution of higher life. You may deny spirit, you may call the reasoning faculty material, but how can you explain

the coming into being of men like Newton, Darwin, Shakespeare, Michael Angelo, Buddha and Jesus from the common man, indeed from the lowest of all but inanimate organism. There is a great law which brings about this glorious result. The life of every organism contains in it elements, which are amenable to this law and which dominate the material element that favours only a stationary condition. But it is a law which destroys the individual and the species and out of its ashes brings forth the higher individual and the higher species. Atheists have asserted that the wholesale, indiscriminate, purposeless destruction of myriads of living organisms, for the object of the evolution of the higher species disproves the purpose and the existence of a beneficent God. We do not know what death is and what purpose it serves in nature. But we know that our being responds to the call for the evolution of the higher life and we willingly sacrifice ourselves for it. This is the object and nobility of life. Without it, the life of the greatest and the noblest would be ignoble and not worth having, for our noblest is utterly ignoble, if there were no nobleness infinitely grander to be evolved. This principle in life, by which we are constrained to make every effort to bring into existence the better, is ethics. Scientists and philosophers only speak of it as a principle of life, like the instinct of self-preservation. But it has been pointed out in Chapter IV that the facts and laws of life show that the impulse to be better overrides the instinct of self-

preservation, and the impulse to bring into existence a higher species overrides even this last named instinct in life

The evolution of ethics is like the evolution of eyes under the influence of the sun's rays, as I have said before, in eyeless animals. The eye has passed through many imperfect stages and is still not perfect. But the perfect eye will be still a limited sense. Not so spirit and goodness; they are not matter and there is no limit to their excellencies and to their glories.

Now it may be said that ethics is not reason, nor the social instinct nor self-love but is asserted here to be a principle of life which causes our ideas of the good to be changing under some mysterious influence. Morality is thus supposed to be founded on a shifting sand-bank and the good is an indefinite something of no practical value and is a denial of the prevailing ideas of morality and of sin and evil. The matter has been discussed in the last chapter, where it has been shown that there surely is goodness, though absolute evil be denied. What our reason and consciousness in our present stage of existence recognize to be good is the only good for us. True philosophy can point to no other good. Sidgwick rightly said: "we obviously cannot distinguish what we believe to be right from what really is so." Let us, stick to our present ideas of goodness and eschew its contrary. Striving for goodness, as it *appears* to us will evolve higher forms of goodness. But if we discard our present ideas of goodness, there can be no striving

after goodness and the spirit can not grow. The right, as we know it, is the right for us and it is our clear duty to follow it. By a supreme law of life we follow it. It is in the effort to follow it that a higher right will manifest itself.

This does not however satisfy the philosopher immersed in the old religious idea of an absolute perfection, which existed in Adam or in the golden age or which is contained in revealed immutable laws of morality. Tolstoy and most moral philosophers assume that we have a positive idea of the absolute good. Many philosophers further assert that not only have we an idea of what is perfect but we can compare our present deficiencies with that idea and remedy them. That most acute of psychologists, Descartes, said "How could I doubt or desire, how could I be conscious, that is to say, that any thing is wanting in me and that I am not altogether perfect, if I had not within me the idea of being more perfect than myself in comparison with which I recognize the defects of my nature". The Vedantist is of the same opinion and with perfect logic deduces from that we can be God at once by moral conduct and wisdom in this life of ours. But nobody has yet defined the ultimate good. It is not yet known. All that we know is that the better is being evolved or created. It does not mean that for progress it is necessary that you should know the ultimate best. A straight line, an inch long may be extended to two inches, three inches and to infinity. We can have an idea of it so long as its length is

increasing but we have no positive idea of it when it becomes infinite. Geometricians say it then becomes an infinite circle, that is to say, it ceases to have the properties which the idea of a straight line carries to the ordinary mind. Similarly, we can have an idea of the better but not of the best. The better is however not like the longer line. It is an entity which has no analogy in material ideas. The better is always a new creation, in a higher sense than the creation in the mind of the idea of additional length. It is always assuming a shape quite different from the form from which it is evolved. If mercy was evolved from cruelty, the process can not be analogous to the adding to the length of a line. It is creating an entity which did not exist before in our mind.

The philosophers' idea of the absolute good, on which they found the existence of God, is only a phase of the machine theory of the universe considered like a clock, necessitating the existence of an intelligent clock-maker. It is dangerous to disregard the great religious and philosophic teachers. But they all disagree with one another. Even if they agreed, the facts of science and of history could not be brushed aside because of their authority, because of many acute arguments, because of many fine words and sentiments. We should seek and follow the truth, whatever the consequences and truth shall make us free, as St. John truly said. In this instance we cannot even hesitate for the facts of science and history lead us to ideas, truer and nobler than the old ones. We know that the very best and highest conception

of the absolute good of the ancients is not certainly the noblest and much of it is positively ignoble, according to modern ideas. The Lord of life is not a quiescent dead Lord resting for all time after the labours of creation. He is always creating and the living being is also always creating, as biology tells us. The Lord of life has so ordained that the living being in co-partnership with him shall always be creating the better. In life, the better is very often wholly distinct from what it replaces. Matter and energy and forms of matter may be constant and unchangeable, and if life were simply a form of matter produced by permutation and combination by the manipulation of matter and its forms, life would certainly be only material and not capable of real change and of creation, which can not be the result of matter and its forms. The strength of the philosophers, who assert the unreality of all phenomena or who assert that all is God or all is matter, lies in the analogy drawn from matter that nothing in reality changes. In life however, that is not true. The fact of real change, of ever-new creations and of creative activity is manifest everywhere in life. The artist produces works of exquisite beauty and the poet composes a great epic. The pen, the ink, the canvass the brush and the colours, as well as the lines and forms of figures, and in the case of the poets, the words and the metres, are constant and unchanging. But the works of art and their beauty and nobleness are quite distinct from them and are very often absolutely new creations, which are not the results of matter

and its forms. This is true in every thing connected with life, as has been shown before. In ethics this is exemplified in a striking manner.

Man in co-partnership with some power is always creating the better. It is a grander idea, this evolution of the *better*, than the best we can conceive, than any idea of the ultimate good philosophers may fancy.

The better
accompanies
the more last-
ing.

There is again a great spiritual fact closely connected with the evolution of the *better*. Life, as we have seen before, has no idea of the absolute good. But by a mysterious instinct it recognizes the *better* and is impelled by the law of its existence in co-operation with a mysterious power to create entities which it recognizes to be better. The better is associated with what is more lasting. Cruelty destroys, mercy preserves. Falsehood is required for weaker and more evanescent forms of life. Truth accompanies the more lasting forms. Ugliness accompanies death. Beauty accompanies life. It is probable that this instinct of being and creating the better is the instinct for obtaining a more lasting form of life. However that may be, the instinct and the power are inherent in life. But this power of creating the better and the more lasting can be exercised only in co-operation with another Power. The better, the more spiritual and the more lasting are being brought into existence, are surely being created by the Lord of life in co-operation with tiny, weak, helpless living beings.

Most philosophers, ancient and modern, however, say that the good can exist of itself without God. Let us consider the matter. Kant the greatest among modern philosophers said : " Nothing can possibly be conceived in the world or out of it, which can be considered good without qualification, except a good will. Intelligence, wit, judgment and the other talents of the mind, however they may be named, or courage, resolution, perseverance, as qualities of temperament, are undoubtedly good and desirable in many respects, but these gifts of nature may also become extremely bad and mischievous if the mind which is to make use of them and which therefore constitutes what is called character is not good. It is the same with the gift of fortune. A good will appears to constitute the indispensable condition even of being worthy of happiness. A good will is good, not because of what it performs or accomplishes, nor by its aptness for the attainment of some proposed end, but simply in virtue of its volition, that is, it is good in itself." We need not subscribe to the opinion about the final absolute good of the philosopher, which is clearly untenable, but we at once feel the force of the statement that reason, strength, aesthetic culture, courage, service of man and all the virtues, that we know of, are not good without the good will and may be evil without it. This is the burden of Iranian and Vedic hymns to the good Asura. This is the burden of the story of the Mahabharata, the longest and the greatest epic in the

Ethics is not possible without God.

world. Duryadhana, it is said had learning, observance of religious practices, heroism, generosity and all the human ordinary and kingly virtues, still he was the Evil personified. The good will was wanting. The Mahabharata explains it by saying that reverence to God was wanting. When properly considered the two positions are identical. Without the soul recognizing a God of righteousness, there can be no purity of motive and no good will. The doctrine that reason and all the other virtues have little to do with goodness is to a large extent true. The fact shows that goodness is not quite identical with what people call virtues. But Kant's good will may itself, like other virtues, be evil. Indulgence of and leniency to the evil and the idle and forbearance from their punishment may proceed from good will and thus may be evil. So the good will has to be defined. When it is not regulated by reason and strengthened by unflinching regard for truth and sense of power and the will to vanquish the evil, and is not purified by Him who alone is good, it becomes evil. It is not reason nor is it any particular virtue. Indeed, no conception of goodness, without Him "who alone is good", who is the Searcher of the heart and without whose influence acting in the heart there can be no purity, is found on examination ultimately to be other than evil. Our nature owes allegiance to the good. It responds to the law by which the better, that is, higher life is evolved. Our life also knows its Lord, and all the virtues, without Him, it recognizes to be of not much worth.

To be sure, ethics without the good God is meaningless, notwithstanding all the arguments of moral philosophers to the contrary. Burns wrote :—

Morality, thou deadly bane,
Thy tens o'thousands thou hast slain ;
Vain is his hope, whose stay and trust is
In moral mercy, truth and justice.

Millions of modern men have sympathized with the poet in his despair. Conventional morality has certainly slain her tens of thousands and the hope, that it has given, reason says, is certainly vain. But if it is true that a higher life is being evolved for the living being by his own strenuous efforts with the aid of the merciful Lord of life, morality is not a bane and the man has good reason to hope, whose stay and trust is in mercy, truth and justice.

We have been through the mazes of philosophic speculations and scientific theories and the dogmas of religions about God and morality, about virtue and evil and sin, about heaven and hell. We have wandered in the gloomy regions of terror and doubt, as well as in the dreary deserts of austere hopeless, self-sufficient, godless philosophic nobleness. Let us now go to the consideration of what true religion is, judged by the 'principles of positive philosophy.

CHAPTER VIII.

DEFINITION OF POSITIVE RELIGION.

Religion has been variously defined. It might have originally the meaning of ancestor-worship, the worship of the ghost, the worship of trees and stones and animals and of the great luminaries of heaven. We find it connected in its early stages with a sense of terror and the supposed necessity of propitiating malignant spirits with bloody sacrifices. The satisfied malignant spirits were, in consequence of such sacrifices, supposed to love their devotees. Indra, the god of the Aryans, destroyed the enemies of Sudas, the king, being propitiated by Homa sacrifices. The Jews were the special favourites of Jehova, who was their king and protector, and who destroyed their enemies. Every family and race imagined that by special sacrifices, it had made some terrible god its peculiar god. There is thus an intimate connection between terror and love. Thus the noble and beautiful flower of love of God, which manifested itself in Chaitanya, St. Francis di Assisi and other saints of Asia and Europe, has been evolved out of its very contrary namely, the terror of the malignant ghosts and powers. Thus has every ethical and religious idea grown.

The ideas of religion are growing and it is futile to enunciate a final definition of religion. Great philosophers have however attempted to do so

Their speculations are deeply interesting and worthy of all respect. Let us consider them and give them our best consideration.

Religion etymologically means that which binds,* and some dictionaries define it as the recognition of the supernatural powers and of the duty lying upon man to yield obedience, worship and love to these, and the performance of our duties. In this sense it has been popularly understood. Analysed by philosophers it has come to have various meanings.

Moral philosophers, who had a very sublime, idea of God and ethics, taught that it was identical with law and moral conduct. Hindu philosophers defined religion or Dharma as that which supports the universe and that it meant following the revealed divine laws about morality and ceremonial religious observances laid down in the Vedas. Later, it came to mean following the laws of Manu and worshipping the Sun Siva, Krishna and Kali for children and riches, fame and destruction of enemies, up to the fiftieth year, and after fifty, leaving all things and desire and all worship and contemplating that one was himself the supreme God.

Zoroaster said religion was worship of the good God and standing up for him in his eternal fight with the Evil One.

* Some Christian religious philosophers say religion means 'binding back' man to his creator after the rupture between God and Adam for the latter's disobedience by eating of the fruit of the tree of knowledge. Now the fruits of that tree have become so marvellously good and sweet that no even the most orthodox would reject them, notwithstanding all the injunctions of the Vedas, the Bible of the Koran and no Othman or Buktiar Khilji would now think of burning libraries as useless and pernicious.

Kant understood religion to be indetical with morality in its highest form, or virtue without desire of reward, which is also inculcated in the Bhagvat Gita of the Hindus.

Buddha and the Karmavadins of India defined religion as the practice of morality and good works and considered them superior to all the gods. The pre-eminence given to morality in religion and the philosophic theory of the possibility of its existence without God led to the denial of God, the first step to such denial being a philosophic assertion of the unknowableness of God, which pleased the populace, who could not discard God altogether.

The great sceptic Hume defined religion as "the practice of morality and the assent of the understanding to the proposition that God exists".* The pantheistic Hindu Upanishada said the same thing and declared that all that is knowable about God is that "He exists." The philosophic Christian divines, Plotinus and Scotus Erigena, were very nearly of the same opinion and even went further. The latter said: "On account of His super-eminence God may not improperly be called Nothing." The later Buddhists actually set up images of Sunya or Nothingness and considered its worship as true religion. This shows how strangely the atheists, sceptics, pantheists and philosophic Christians, of ancient and modern times, agree.

Fichte says that 'God is the established order of events, to fulfil duty in accordance with which

* Posthumous Works.

makes blessed and religion is to rest upon their order and to further it'.

Schiermacher defined religion "as the knowledge of our absolute dependence on something which determines us and which we cannot determine in return." Another philosopher says "it is an intercourse, a conscious and voluntary intercourse entered into by a soul in distress with the mysterious power upon which it feels itself to depend and upon which its fate is contingent."

The Mimansakas of ancient India also spoke of *Adrishta*—the unseen—which determines the life of man and which man can not determine but added to this the doctrine that this power unseen is produced by our actions. The Muhammadan considers this "unseen" "fate" as the will of God and submits himself to it with a noble resignation.

Hegel on the contrary defines religion, as "uncontrolled liberty;" "for" he says that "if it is dependence which makes religion then the dog is the most religious of all beings." His definition is identical with that of Manu, who says "independence of all things is happiness, all dependence is sorrow." Buddha was of the same opinion and forbade people entering into the meshes of worshipping and relying on the higher powers and becoming "food of the gods," out of desire.

Hegel and the Vedanta say that religion is knowledge of the divine spirit and of the finite spirit which leads to self-union with God. Further, Hegel

considers religious consciousness as conceiving God, "not as a mere object, but as the process of self-distinction and the sublation of the distinction in which God is called love or holy Trinity and make Himself objectively and thereby known Himself". This is identical with the Vedantic idea, with the triune manifestation of the pantheistic Brahman, as Siva, Vishnu and Brahma, notwithstanding Hegel's contemptuous condemnation of the Vedanta in grossly abusive language quite unbecoming a philosopher.* Bergson says philosophy or religion can only be an effort of the individual to dissolve again into the whole †

Feuerbach says religion is love of one's self, "for the feeling which is at the base of all feelings, desires and actions of man, is the satisfying of the human being and human egoism, it is the sick heart of man which is the source of all religion and all misery." The Hindu Upanishada says that the "Self is dearer than son and riches and every thing else" and that "the Self is to be seen, heard and meditated upon." The philosophical distinction between the little self and the great self, the ordinary human mind cannot comprehend and must be left to the philosophers who speak of it. To the ordinary intellect, Feuerbach's definition is identical with that of the Upanishada and "it is this sick heart of man", which Buddha also found "was the source of misery",

* See Hegel's History of Philosophy.

† Creative Evolution p. 202.

and his religion was supposed to supply the medicine for curing it and he was therefore acclaimed by millions in Asia as the " Prince of Physicians."

The new Nietzschean idea of religion is that which leads to power. That was also the root idea of the old ascetics of ancient India, who thought that religious austerities led to power equal to that of the gods. Jesus also entertained that ancient belief of eastern ascetics, for when speaking of powers of healing and exorcising, he expressly says : " this sort of thing can be had only by fasting and prayer."

Modern writers have greatly widened the meaning of religion. One says that it means "that which endeavours to bring man into contact with a higher power. It may mean faith, cult, morality, hope, terror, ecstasy, fear of the gods." Some say that "it is the noblest instinct in man". From that the African Negro kneels down before his fetish and from that instinct also St. Francis di Assesi knelt down in his cloister.

William James says that religion means : " The feelings, acts, experiences of modern men in their solitude so far as they apprehend themselves to stand in relation to whatever they may consider the divine."*

Professor J. R. Seeley says that any " habitual and regulated admiration is worthy to be called religion," and " that the music, the science and the

*Varieties of Religious Experience p. 31.

civilization of modern man, as now organized and believed in, form the more genuine religion of our time."*

Professor Moore says : " True religion apart from dogma is the sublimed essence of the knowledge of the highest things in the world." †

Professor Ribot said : "Of religions sentiment properly so called nothing survives at last save a vague respect for the unknowable which is the last relic of the fear and a certain attraction towards the ideal, which is a relic of the love that characterized the earlier periods of religious growth. To state this more simply religion tends into religious philosophy". Vacherot also thought that 'religion will finally disappear in scientific philosophy'.

Thus dependence on law, established order of things and fate, knowledge, power, asceticism, morality and philosophy have all been considered religion by philosophers, moralists and scientists and mystics, in their pride, but the common man with his sorrows and joys, toil and trouble, in the humility which the realities of life produce, ignores these vain imaginings and dead word-creations. He has, as we have been before, not been much troubled with the futilities of such speculations.

Agnosticism has also been considered a religion. The idea flowed naturally from philosophy and science being considered religion.

*Natural Religion and Edition. Boston p. 98, 123.

† The Origin and Nature of Life p. 1.

Herbert Spencer did not deny God but denied that any apprehension of Him was possible and asserted that the ideas of religion with which he was familiar were inconsistent with science. He therefore said: "We are obliged to regard every phenomenon as a manifestation of an unlimited and incomprehensible Power** Of religion we must remember that the recognition of the supreme verity has been its vital element **. If religion and science are to be reconciled, the basis of reconciliation must be this deepest, widest and most certain of all facts, that the Power which the universe manifests to us is utterly inscrutable." This is denying God altogether. By God is meant the Being with whom living creatures are bound by ties nearer and more intimate than with any other being or thing—upon whom their life, goodness and intellect are based. Herbert Spencer and all agnostics would believe that God is only the unexplained residuum, which science can not explain. They do not believe that we can have any thing to do with Him. This is the negation of all religion. The supreme Power or Verity has been explained. by one modern philosopher as the entire earth so far as life on earth is concerned. Another great modern philosopher inculcates belief in spirits ruling the earth, the sun &c. This is old Egyptian and Indian spiritualistic paganism in the modern scientific garb. Agnosticism and worship of the supreme verity have assumed strange forms at the hands of modern scientific philosophers.

The same agnosticism has been naturally and logically applied to the nature of the Ego. Herbert

Spencer was a consistent agnostic. He rightly said that we also know nothing of the nature of the thing we call I. Descartes said, 'I think therefore I am'. The entity that thinks is the I. Another great philosopher says I feel therefore I am. The feeling entity is the Ego. A third philosopher tells us that the entity that wills is the Ego. All this is verbal quibbling, for the question is whether thinking, feeling and willing are not results of material combinations, like circulation of blood. Words have always fascinated the minds of the most acute philosophers. Words have been considered as symbols of realities and grammarians and manufactures of words have put forth their word-creations as wonderful realities. However that may be, the truth exists and words only attempt to express it. Herbert Spencer was more correct than Descartes when he said that we knew nothing of the true nature of the Ego. But the consciousness of the Ego is there. Descartes was right when he said that this consciousness was the truest and deepest consciousness in life. The consciousness in life of the relation of life to God, which is the unexplained residuum, is truer and deeper still, as I have attempted to show. If the agnostics say that the consciousness of God is as true and deep-seated in the existence of living beings as the consciousness of the Ego, they are surely the most devout of the believers in God. But that is not their real meaning. . They are materialists, who cannot make themselves believe that the universe came into existence solely through the operation of matter and they satisfy their doubting

minds and further conciliate the powerful priests and their church-going neighbours by posing as champions of God against atheistic science.

Agnosticism, revelation and assertion of definite perfect knowledge of God are closely allied to one another. 'God is unknowable by human intellect, therefore he makes himself known by revelations. Revelations about the character and doings of God are divine and infallible and therefore our knowledge of God derived from them is perfect and infallible'. This is without doubt strictly logical. A large class of philosophers and theologians therefore go to the extreme of asserting that the nature of God can be definitely known by man. Cardinal Newman said : " I do not see much difference between avowing that there is no God and implying that nothing definite can be known about Him." Most religious men would agree with the great cardinal. But the impossibility of any definite knowledge of the Lord of the universe by the little brain of man is obvious. The God who is definitely known must be a being created by the fancy of man in his own model. Philosophers and theologians have from the most ancient times been defining God as the absolute, the beautiful and the good. But they have always failed to define these terms. The sceptics have easily confuted their arguments and proved that their ideas of the good, the beautiful, the just and the like, as shown in their ideas of God, have always been found to be the reverse of the good, the beautiful and the just, by suc-

Revealed
God.

ceeding generations, with the progress of man. Some of the greatest of philosophers have truly said that the God definitely known is no God.

* But the living being by its constitution recognizes the better, the truer, the more beautiful and the more merciful. This principle is the cause of the evolution of higher forms of life. God is better than the very best we are yet conscious of. This knowledge is positive and not merely negative and is based on the close relationship between God and the living being. Our very being recognizes it as the supreme purpose of life to realize this relationship. It unconsciously adopts with love this principle of the better, which, for the want of a more definite and truer definition of Him, it calls God and values it even above its own life. The worshippers of the God known definitely have always fallen back on revelations. They say that revelations, contained in such books, as the Vēdas, the Old Testament, the New Testament and the Koran, give the true definition of God. But the definitions contained in these books are in hopeless conflict with one another and the confident assertion of followers of revealed religion of definite knowledge of God derived from their particular sacred books can not be relied upon. In their perplexity many men, who accept the position that no religion is possible, except one that is revealed, become atheists or agnostics who would have no religion of any kind. It is however, fortunately possible to have a religion without such definite knowledge, the opposed to all reason, as is contained in revealed books or in speculations of philosophers based on such books.

The opinions of the philosophers are worthy of our respectful consideration, for they who propounded these theories and grappled with the great questions, were the greatest among the sons of men—they were the rare spirits which have appeared on the earth from time to time for the amelioration of their race. None of them, prophets and philosophers, have however agreed with their brother-teachers, as the Mahabharata in a very well-known passage laments, and thus in our perplexity, we humbler mortals do not know whom to follow and what to believe. The reason of this difference is apparent. Each one of these great men impressed upon his followers that his idea was the final word and absolutely infallible. Most of the founders of theistic religions, perceiving the difficulty of reconciling their dogmas with reason, declared that what they taught was the word of God Himself revealed through them as incarnations of God or as prophets and apostles specially missioned by Him. Most of them were deceived, by their sense of power over their fellows into believing themselves as superhuman and akin to Divinity, as they could not rise above the prevailing ancient belief in supernatural powers of Samans and wise old men and women and also above the belief, very pleasant to men in power, that successful great men were special favourites of God. Their confidence in themselves led humbler mortals, out of admiration and fear, to follow them, very often for the good of the latter, for the teachers were surely great men having much greater appreciation of the Good than their contemporaries. In after times, their followers

and the learned priests, who made their living by supporting their systems, when confronted by the facts of science, fell back upon miracles and the word of the teachers that their dogmas were revealed and thus satisfied their consciences. But if the history of religions had been studied and investigated before, as they are being done now, those great minds, who had a better appreciation of the truth than their fellows, would surely have been very diffident in claiming infallibility.

The conflict of opinion of philosophers and religions men is attempted to be reconciled by eclecticism which appeals to many. It is considered by a large class of religious philosophers that all religions are good and none should be discarded. They say that "truth is contained and that in which they all agree," and that all religions may meet in a parliament of religions and fraternise. Find out the absolute truth from existing religions, for it is there, they say.

Eclecticism.

In this view, fetish worship, devil-worship, worship of millions of gods and goddesses, good and evil, worship of human incarnations of God and inspired prophets, worship of icons, saints, Himalayan Mahatmas, tombs and Chaityas, pantheism, ethical religion, the religion of humanity, agnosticism and pure atheism, as well as Bacchanalian orgies, human sacrifices and the cult of the Thug, are all good or are in their essence good. This frame of mind, which is supposed to be very philosophical, arises out of want of proper regard for truth and from a desire

to please every body and to escape the disagreeableness of offending one's neighbours or other powerful men. It is in accordance no doubt with Manu's rule of not telling disagreeable truths, but it is surely the worst kind of falsehood, for it encourages our brother-men to continue in their course of life of superstition and error and often, of cruelty and wickedness.

The idea of the eclectics is in reality a phase of the old doctrine of the original purity of all religions

Max Muller said that "the elements and roots of religion were there as far as we can trace the history of man. An intuition of God, a sense of human weakness and dependence, a belief in Divine Government of the world, a distinction between good and evil and a hope of a better life, these are some of the radical elements of all religions. Though sometimes hidden, they rise again and again to the surface. Unless they had formed part of the original dowry of the human soul, religion itself would have been an impossibility." *Modern investigations in early beliefs of the primitive races have shown that most of the above assumptions are unfounded. Max Muller was further of opinion that "the more we go back, the more we examine the earliest germs of every religion, the purer, I believe, we shall find the conceptions of the Deity." † This is the old idea of the Brahmins that the Satya Yuga or the

*Chips from a German workshop Vol. I Pref. X.

†Science of Language Vol. II. p. 467.

age of truth and virtue prevailed with the primitive man. It is the same idea that is inculcated in the Bible that Adam and Eve in their naked purity were perfect beings and by eating the fruit of the tree of knowledge, they fell down from their high estate. All these beliefs are wholly unfounded and unscientific and if insisted upon, will lead to absolute atheism and negation of all morality, for primitive man, it is now proved, had no idea of the Good or of God, as we understand the terms. Indeed, they considered the very contrary of what are now regarded as good to be good. What would now be considered as the Devil was considered by them as God.

Let us now consider the history of the evolution of religious ideas among men. It is the consideration of the facts of history that can destroy all fancies and false dogmas and lead us to truth.

The evolution of man from the lowest forms of life is now accepted by all unprejudiced persons. Atheism accompanied the all but material constitution of rudimentary organizations and is a necessary accompaniment of the material element in all living beings and manifests itself in a hundred ways in the lives and thoughts of even the most philosophic among them. Primitive man was no better than the beast and was an absolute atheist. Biologists and investigators of the habits and customs of primitive races tell us with truth that religion is comparatively a new mental growth.*

*Read's Natural and Social Morals p. 222.

Theism has been slowly evolving out of atheism like sight out of blindness in nature. Even now most men have not been able to shake off the old atheism. The Buddhists who are the majority of mankind are atheists. The idea of God, which must be the outcome of the highest development of the intellect and the spirit, could not have been apprehended by the primitive man nor is it easy of apprehension by the greatest among men even at the present day. It is therefore not surprising that the best and the most truthful among philosophers, who despised cant and word-quibbles, denied the reality of the apprehension of God. Philosophers have seldom been believers in God. The famous six Darshanas or systems of philosophy of ancient India were atheistic. But there have been believers in God also from very early times. It is but natural that their definitions of religion and God are imperfect. We have seen that the great philosophers saw the imperfections of these definitions and in their attempts to avoid them, were led into speculations like pantheism, agnosticism and the like and generally denied the personal God. This denial of the personal God is the colouring which the original atheism of man has given to the growing consciousness of God. Many philosophers deny this growth of the consciousness of God and with much truth point out that the greatest of philosophers and founders of religions have in their definition of religion only reiterated the variegated ideas about religion, theistic, atheistic, materialistic, spiritualistic and agnostic, which have come down

to us from a period at least six hundred years before Christ, if not earlier. For over three thousand years, we have been debating practically the same questions with unsatisfying results. But this is only natural when we consider how slowly the idea and love of God have been evolved in the heart of man. All definitions of God can not but be imperfect and shall always be imperfect, but they will become better clearer and more definite with the evolution of higher powers of life.

Religion of
the primitive
man.

Tyler and other investigators of the origin and development of religion have abundantly shown that at first religion meant the worship of the ghost of the ancestor and this ghost was the god who was the particular god of the worshipper, who could compel him or wheedle him by prayers, incantations or offerings to fulfil the desire of the worshipper in a miraculous way. Prayers and formulas and fixed forms gradually came into existence as capable of compelling the god. The god became in time the god of the family. The god of the powerful family was worshipped by other families. Slowly this god became the god of the tribe, and lost the character of being the god of the individual. Religion has come to be a social or political institution. A modern writer has said that, "religion has but shallow roots in most people, is chiefly effective in support of older instincts and depends for its activity upon general consent and public observance." " Magic and animism of every sort from devil-worship to faith-healing have perennial sources in human nature" says the same

author who is not partial to any religion. Man has called spiritualism, magic, the worship of the tribal god, ceremonial, social and religious observances and the like religion. But from all this jungle of evil superstition and falsehood, the idea of the true personal God is emerging.

Our present ideas of the good and of God have scarcely anything in common with the ideas of the good and of the God the primitive savage. Similarly before the idea of the good and of God which will be evolved hereafter, our present ideas would seem evil. The only thing in common is life. Out of life is springing forth the idea of the good and of God. We cannot yet indicate the process how, but as intellect, ethics and the other powers of life grow and become finer, we shall have clearer and clearer apprehension of it. The ideas about God and religion are certainly progressing.

Macaulay declared as the result of his reading of history that neither natural theology nor revealed religion is a progressive science. But later investigators of the history and civilization of man have established that "religion, as much as any science, is progressive in its nature and that man's religious thought broadens with the flight of time" *The powers of life have been growing. From the speck on what would euphemistically be called the head of low organisms, the noble eye of man has been evolved. The intellect has grown and is growing. The ethical ideas, have grown from forms absolutely unethical

Religion
progressive.

*Moore's Origin and Nature of Life p. 2.

and ignoble, according to our ideas, to noble forms wholly different from their original shape. Life and its powers, its senses, its intellect, its ethics, have been growing. Religion is the crown of Life. It must grow with the growth of the powers of Life. The God of the savage can not be the God of the highly civilized man, as the ethics of the former are wholly different from those of the latter. The great mistake is to consider that they are at bottom identical and to ignore the law of progress, which rules the universe of life. The idea of God, if there be any, must grow with the growth of our intellect and our ethics. We can say that the five senses, we have, exhaust the powers of life? The sense-perceptions also may become so fine after ten thousand years as to be quite different from our present perceptions. It is the most presumptuous of men, who will now say that man is the acme of creation—the final word of Nature in its evolution of life in the physical plane. Even in this little satellite of the Sun, called the Earth, a nobler species than man may well be evolved in time as science teaches us. Positive philosophy recognizes the great fact of continuous progress. Its mission is to eschew all fanciful ideas, to ignore all confident assertions and to deny the authority of unreason, supported on the ground of mysteriousness and revelation. Science unravels mysteries and does not accept them as insoluble and divine. We have to examine the ethical rules of conduct and the ideas of religion, of which the faculties of the ordinary

man, in his present stage of progress, have perception, and recognizing the reality of the law of progress, both in ethics and in religion, try to ascertain the truth.

We have seen how philosophers disagree in their definition of religion and how science has discarded most of the dogmas of prevailing religions. It is generally said that religion can have no basis in positive science. Auguste Comte therefore called his cult of the worship of humanity and of woman in special and of space and earth as positive religion. It has been shown before how it is a travesty of the name. If religion with the love and worship of the true God can have no basis in positive facts of life and nature there is no God and no religion. We have laboriously gone through the objections of philosophy and science to the belief in personal God and religion and have found that God and the close relationship of man to God are real, and that man feels the necessity of worshipping and loving the Father and the Lover above all lovers. Such belief and consciousness of such relationship constitute religion. It has been attempted in these pages to prove that they are based on sure foundations of the facts of life and of science and not on revelations, fancies and specious arguments. A religion having such a foundation can surely be termed positive.

Positive religion eschews all fanciful and mysterious ideas about God, soul, immortality of individual existence, prayer, adoration, divine love, heaven and hell, which are not consistent with reason and

science. It attempts however, to show that eschewing all that, there may still be a conduct indispensable for the progress of life, which scientific methods will prescribe, in which God, his love towards low individual existences, immortality of the soul, goodness and purity may be essential. It is absolutely ridiculous for a man, however great, to attempt to know God and his ways, with any degree of definiteness. A minute animalcule, if it speculated on the existence and the nature of man, would have greater reason to justify its conduct, than man, who in relation to the universe is more insignificant, than an animalcule is in relation to him. This fact was forgotten by philosophers and prophets in their presumption, which their ignorance in past ages alone could justify. But there is a stupendous fact in nature, namely, that the intellect and the spirit of man, though circumscribed by his undeveloped sense-organs, aspire after the Infinite in matter and intellect and also after the absolutely Good, the utterly beautiful and the everlasting. This aspiration is one of the ingredients of what is called religion. This leads to the realization of the relationship between God and the living being, which we have found to be real. The self-culture and the conduct which lead to such realization is religion.

Positive religion will not imagine any fanciful God and create a religion on vain imaginings. It does not begin at the end. It begins from the beginning *i.e.*, from the existing low condition of man in

reference to the universe. It has cognizance only of the existing forces and facts of life and their true bearing on the great facts of infinite Nature. Science and philosophy systematize the facts of life and the facts, which the history of the life of man hitherto has brought to light. Which way do these facts lead us? Is there a goal visible? Has man any apprehension of what is best for the development of life—of what is the absolutely good? The agnostic says, he has not, and he cannot be proved to be wrong. But there is one stupendous fact in Nature. Man has always placed before him an ideal. That ideal, history tells us, was low and evil in the beginning, according to modern standards. From evil, good has been evolved on account of the striving of man after what to him seemed excellent at the time—though that excellent was evil according to modern ideas. Beneficent Nature has her ways of doing things and bringing forth the Excellent. The strenuous effort of the living being however, is indispensable for the result. The industry of the cultivator is essential for the production of crops and beautiful flowers, though it is Nature that brings them forth in her mysterious ways. That is true also in all the phenomena of life. The evolution of the higher species is dependent on the strenuous effort of the individuals of the existing species, though it is Nature that mainly brings about the wonderful result. Goodness and religion assume nobler and nobler forms with the coming into existence of the nobler species. The living being is co-worker with Nature in bringing about this wonderful

result. Science and positive philosophy recognize the fact. They are compelled to recognize the mysterious force in nature, which, like the earth cultivated by man producing the flower, produces this wonder of wonders. Man, who is in his primitive stage murdered his own parents, to whom the power of killing and the power of capturing as many women as he could by killing his fellowmen were the best of virtues, to whom the power of deceiving the more powerful beasts of prey and trapping animals and his fellowmen was the highest exercise of his intellect and ethics, certainly that primitive man, did not strive to bring about the result that his descendants would be inoffensive, gentle, well-meaning, merciful men like Jesus and Buddha. The result has been brought about against his wishes and in spite of him. The result could not have been brought about, except by strenuous endeavour, except by cruel suffering on his part. He was the human sacrifice of the savage man, whose blood fertilized the earth and brought forth the beautiful crops. He has been apparently an unwilling co-worker with Nature. It is the work of positive philosophy to show the way how he ought to be and can be a willing co-worker. It shows that Nature by herself would not produce the fine fruits and flowers, which are the improved species or new creations brought about by culture by the scientific agriculturist. It is also conscious of the fact that human knowledge and endeavour, without the help of Nature, can not bring about the result. The combination of intellect and nature and above all of strenuous effort of the living are necessary new crea-

tions. But it has been abundantly shown in these pages that without the co-operation of an ineffable Power and will, superior to nature and life, the marvellous result would be impossible. Science teaches us that there must be a Power higher than both, whose co-operation is necessary for the realization of the result.

Positive philosophy shows that pain and death are parts of the process for the evolution of the good and the beautiful. Strenuous endeavour, pain and death are the necessary ingredients of the good and the beautiful, and the philosopher, who perceives it, loses his terror of pain and death. The true philosopher has the apprehension of the third Power, higher than nature and the intellect of man mentioned above. He becomes a willing co-worker. Goodness and beauty are higher than splendid fruits and flowers. They are spiritual fruits and flowers, brought about in nature. Higher and higher goodness is surely being evolved in nature. The prophet Isaiah truly said: "For as the earth bringeth forth the bud, as the garden causeth the things that are sown to grow; so the Lord God will cause righteousness and praise to spring forth before all the nations." *A mysterious Power is causing the flower of righteousness to grow and to assume more beautiful forms every day. It has requisitioned human effort for the purpose. The effort is the badge of the nobility of man. The human sacrifice was noble. Christ crucified is the noblest symbol of Nature. There is no one nobler and more fortunate than he whose crucifixion was required and is required and will be

* Isaiah LXI. II.

required in future for the evolution of the *Kingdom of God*. The greater the effort, the greater the sacrifice, the nobler is the man, who is required to make it. Man is the co-worker with Nature and the Power that is above all. Positive religion attempts to show this great fact, which includes the endeavour and the excellence of the goal. Positive religion attempts to lay down the rule of conduct, which will make man in time the willing, instead of being the unwilling terrified co-worker. It may be that in the result a relationship of love shall be perceived by him between him and the Co-worker of whom he is conscious but whom he does not know with any definiteness. It is this relationship, which is the essence and the goal of Religion.

Positive religion takes into account all the existing facts of human life, finds out the laws governing them and so orders them as to hasten the evolution of the better and of truer ideas of God and religion. It does not ignore any religion but it eschews all superstition, all fear, all unreason, all meanness, all selfishness, all oppression of the poor and the weak by the rich and the powerful. It attempts to lay down a rule of life for man, who is groping in the dark and vainly putting forth his hands in order to be able to touch the loving God of whose existence he is conscious, which would make all his faculties act in accord with the great Co-worker and which is like the law, which makes the flowers turn towards the sun for their expansion and for the development of their wonderful tints.

Ideas of ethics and of God are dependent on the stage in which mankind may be, in its onward path of progress. They become nobler, truer and more spiritual as man progresses. There thus can be no final definition of goodness or of religion, and that is not attempted in these pages. It has been attempted, not only to show the deficiencies of ancient religions consequent on the comparatively greater ignorance and less advanced ideas, ethical, social and religious, of the times in which they originated, in reference to modern ideas, but also to demonstrate the futility of the philosophers, who deny ethics and God because of the errors in the prevailing systems and who laugh at believers in goodness and love, on the strength of the ancient arguments about pain and the modern arguments about the stronger species eating up the weaker and the submerging of the weak in the struggle for existence in the vast and dreary sea of life. These philosophers are content with the theory of evolution as applicable to the animal but have little appreciated that the sense-perceptions are becoming finer and that new senses may be evolved in time and consequently all our present ideas may be changed altogether in the future. Newer visions of ethics, social virtues and of God are slowly emerging and unfolding before us, which are quite different from the ideas concerning them, which we now entertain.

Positive religion takes note of this fact continual progress and, humbly and with wonder and love, shows a path, which is not inconsistent with the

strictest rules of science and with the highest ideals, man possesses in his present stage of progress. It will require patient and laborious work, for centuries yet to come, of the greatest among philosophers, to put the progressing ethical and religious ideas on a scientific basis. What is attempted in these pages is to show that positive religion is not an impossibility, that it is not true, as is strenuously insisted upon by modern philosophers and scientists, that religion is mere fancy and can have no basis in truth and science. Positive philosophy deals with real things as apprehended by the sense-organs and eschews non-sensual standards. Positive religion walks the same path with the materialist but shows that the path leads to super-sensual goals. Positive religion accepts the ideals of conduct of the materialist but shows that they are not final and that for the realization of the highest ideal of the materialist—the religious ideas of the immortality of the soul and a Lord of Righteousness, who sees the heart and thus gives all its purity to goodness, and of a merciful God are necessary. It tries to lay down the highest and noblest ideals of conduct according to the present stage of the evolution of man. It is thus indistinguishable from atheistic ethics. But it goes further and shows that all ideas of the good are growing and God is the sun, which makes the flower of goodness and beauty and love to expand.

If the scientist can not explain why flowers expand and develop beautiful tints under the influence of heat and light, if the evolutionist can not

explain how the eye has developed under the influence of the light of the sun, does it follow that the sun is the inscrutable verity of which we know nothing and to which we should give the go by, and that its contemplation is fruitless? The agnostic scientists and philosophers say God is unknowable. It has been shown in Chapter II that the truth is, God is increasingly knowable and man finds him to be so. In his inmost consciousness, man is convinced of His presence, and He is manifesting himself more and more clearly in it. Positive religion is conscious of the fact and establishes a relationship between man and God and ponders over it and shows the reality of its consciousness, which leads man to try to hear the Lord of life, to touch Him and to love Him.

Religion is the relationship of living beings to the great God, who is greater than the universe with its innumerable suns and higher than the milky way, than the heaven above us. It is inconceivable that the low animalcule man can have any definite idea of the great God, But the sweet relationship is there. What is this little thing, with his little brains and senses, that the everlasting Lord God of the universe shall incline His ear to hear him or to speak to him or to touch him? "What is man that Thou art mindful of him and the son of man that Thou regardest him," truly said the psalmist. Many saints and utterly truthful men have testified to the experience of real communion. Such experience can surely be the result of nervous derangement of infinitely vain

or hysterical persons. But surely it is also possible for the merciful Lord to make his creatures feel His touch. The soft hand is on our shoulders always, though we may have no apprehension of it or of its character, which we can define. Positive religion is based on the reality of such relationship. It prescribes a rule of conduct based on such assumption, which is consistent with science and truth. What is unscientific and untrue, it eschews, and still finds such assumption possible and conduct based on such assumption indispensable for progress.

Religion is based upon personal relationship with the true God. It is not the worship of the tribal God, it is not the following of a social idea. Religion is not ethics, is not wisdom, is not philosophy. It is the best of all things, philosophy and art, science and ethics, and more and better than they. Religion is an element of the supreme spiritual law, which overrides the apparently relentless and eternal law of Nature, which sacrifices the individual for the species and the species for the race. It is having the frame of mind which makes us act and live, guided by the belief in the existence of a Being, through whose influence life comes into existence from matter and progresses from an all-but material condition to pure spirit, from unreason to reason, from cruelty to mercy, from selfishness to pure altruism, from fear to fearlessness, from dependence to freedom, and which is dominated by the consciousness that God is with His poor children always in all the vicissitudes through which life has to pass in its up-

ward path. It is that which perceives the relationship between the individual life and the true God and the law by which the individual life expands and attains to perfection by contact with Him. It is the religion with the belief in a personal God, which alone can give a motive to a wise man—the man with the clear sight spoken of by Buddha—not to discard life with its manifold ills and all but unbearable sorrows, and to strive manfully and advance slowly in the painful path of progress from matter and non-life to spirit and the free and the perfect life. It is a personal relationship in which self is glorified, based a personal relationship through the family, the tribe, the race and the whole animate universe, as being members of the same family of God. It is a relationship, which does not want more for self than for others—it is a relationship in which the greatest self-realization and the utmost selflessness coalesce. Its personal character, should not be forgotten, for without it there can be philosophy but no religion. It shows that a supreme Being is necessary for the evolution of higher life and that He has so willed that all living beings should be co-workers with Him in evolving the highest, the noblest and the most spiritual life and as such co-workers naturally attain to a love for Him which is purer and nobler than any love we can imagine.

Positive religion attempts to show that by the process of evolution, the idea of God, by which is understood personal God, for an impersonal God is no God to unphilosophical men who can not appreciate word-quibbles, is surely and clearly coming to be

apprehended. It does not define God, but shows his influence on life. It understands by religion nothing more than the apprehension and appreciation of the influence, which may lead to the noblest and sweetest of all relationship between two *persons*.

Positive religion enjoins such conduct as would be indispensable if there were a personal God, who is the supporter of life and of its law of progress and who loves the individual with a love transcending all mortal love. It makes man yield willing obedience to what he considers would please his God, to cultivate wisdom and morality and aesthetics and all the powers of life, to pray to him, to worship Him, to love Him and to sacrifice himself for Him. In this conduct and strenuous effort to attain the perfect life, we transcend ourselves and "truth and fact well up into our lives in ways that exceed verbal formulation" and the finite in us comes in contact with the Infinite and has apprehension of Him.

Religion is not morality. It is not ceremonial practices enforced by the state, society or books, supposed to be revealed. We have seen before that without penal sanctions for non-conformity and active support of the state, none of the existing great religions would be able to keep up their splendid institutions and even to preserve their very existence. All religious men should therefore seriously consider what part of their religion is independent of these artificial supports. True religion is based on surer foundations.

Positive religion is opposed to all the ideas of godless moral systems and dry philosophic speculations based on the unreality, the materiality and the impermanence of life and the hollowness of its interests. The interest in their life's work, however noble it may be, must be felt by atheists, pantheists and followers of the religion of humanity as not abiding. To positive religion "the smallest details of this world derive infinite significance not only from their relation to an unseen divine order only," but also to an unseen Person on whom that order is based and with whom the connection of man is of an ineffably sweet character. In social relations no mere humanitarian has ever developed the willing and exemplary service rendered by the man of God who "abounds in impulses to help and whose help is inward as well as outward, for his sympathy extends to souls as well as bodies and kindles unsuspected faculties therein" and "who instead of placing happiness where common men place it, in comfort, places it in a higher kind of inner excitement which converts discomforts into sources of cheer and annuls unhappiness" and who "turns his back upon no duty however thankless" and whose "humble-mindedness and ascetic tendencies", a rational ascetism being a characteristic of positive religion, save him from the petty unhappinesses which embitter the life of man. In positive religion alone is the purity possible which is not possible in a mere godless ethical religion, as we have shown before, inasmuch as the sense of purity is a sense of purity in the heart and in reference to a searcher of the heart. "Felicity,

purity, charity, patience and self-severity"* are possible to a man of God in a greater measure than to a godless philosopher and moralist. Positive religion however avoids the narrow outlook of religious saints who "fall into all sorts of holy excesses, fanaticisms or theopathic absorption, self-torment, prudery, scrupulosity, gullibility, and morbid inability to meet the world." The saints of old with all their saintliness never gave up their hope of the reward of carnal pleasures in another world. Positive religion agrees with the Gita and Kant that goodness is good for its own sake and finds that Buddha was right when he asserted that all the pleasures of heaven of the Hindus, Christians and Muhammadans are ephemeral and ignoble. It shows however that life and its interest are real and not evil and that striving for the good and fighting for it are principles of life, and working for the evolution of the higher life and the better, in co-operation with an ineffable Power, fulfils the purpose of life, which is above any pleasure or happiness and transcends the principle of self-preservation.

*The quotations are from the description of the saint in William James's. *Varieties of Religious Experience* p. 369-370. William James had noble ideas of the saint, though his ideas of religion led to strange positions.

CHAPTER IX.

GOD AND SELF.

There was no idea of life or spirit or God in the beginning. The first idea which primitive man had was that of motionless and moving things. This two-fold classification still persists in legal phraseology of Europe and Asia, the immoveable, and the moveable of Europeans, and the Sthavara and Jangama, which has come down to Hindus from the time of the Vedas. All danger to the primitive man proceeded from moving men, beasts and reptiles. Moving streams, thunder, falling trees and the like from which also man suffered were considered of the same kind of enemies as men and beasts. Next he found that a powerful enemy, beast or man, when dead was powerless and his reason told him that something there was in the body which had left it. He could not conceive that it was dead. He fancied that it existed unseen. At first he thought that it existed attached to some portions of the body, or to tombs and cemeteries or trees and later he thought, like the modern spiritualists, that something existed unattached to the abovementioned things. Thus was the idea of the spirit evolved. The distinction between life and death as now understood is an idea of acute minds of more advanced times, the philosophers and scientists, who pondered on the great problems and doubted the truth of the old notions. But even the great ancient philosophers, as we have seen

before, considered the soul as something like air, breath or fiery something. Ancient and modern philosophers and religions men have not been able to shake off the idea that the soul or spirit is only subtle material something or something having a subtle body or *Sukshma Sarira* as Hindu philosophers say. Spiritualists are still of the same opinion.

Herbert Spencer says : " Shadows, breath and the like are how the spirit is thought of " and " the first stage is one in which spirits originally human become identified with or inhabitants of surrounding objects." Tylor says : " The doctrine of a future life as held by the lower races is all but the necessary outcome of savage animism." Belief in transmigration proceeds from the belief in the " temporary migration of souls into material substances, from human bodies down to morsels of wood and stone." Then comes the belief in the reincarnation of ancestral souls in new-born infants of the family and later on in reincarnation in beasts or men, according to Karma or deserts. These proceed all from the same savage animism. He shows that out of the same savage animism proceeds the faith in souls remaining with their dead bodies or parts of the dead bodies, which prevailed among ancient races, savage and civilized and which is identical with the belief among some savage tribes in an earthly resurrection and with the belief of the Egyptians about the mummies. This is also identical with the belief prevailing in most civilized Christian and Muhammadan countries that the soul after death remains with the dead body

which will resurrect on the last day of judgment. Tylor further shows that from the same animism proceeds the faith in spiritism or spiritualism, with its manifold manifestations, from the ghost of a sorcerer which accompanies a bit of bone to the ghost that resides in trees and vacant houses, cemeteries and burial grounds and which possesses human beings and the ghost that is exorcised by purificatory rites at birth and death among savages and among Hindus and Christians.*

The spirits conceived by the primitive man were living things with just the feelings of the man himself. "They had merely taken the place in his mind previously occupied by the material objects, with which these spirits were so closely associated. They were not even a different class of beings, but just the same as himself, though with different powers and modes of life ; still objects of fear to be placated or terrified to be pleased only with the things that pleased the man or subdued by fear as he himself was." † Thus offerings of animals or men, sacrifices of food, of bed and of women were made to placate them.

In respect to living animals, man "could measure the danger, foresee the consequences, and provide in some degree against them by his own unaided efforts. It was otherwise with those unseen

*Among Scandinavian Christians there was a custom that "till a child is baptized the fire must never be let out lest the trolls should be able to steal the infant." Among Hindus also the light is never let out till the expiration of the period of impurity.

† Hook's *Humanity and its Problems*.

spirits. He could not measure their powers ; neither could he conceive the nature or time of their attack. In himself he was powerless to turn their anger or escape their wrath. He depended solely on the priest. His subjection to the priest was thus due to habit and fear, but a fear of a more insidious and overwhelming kind than that inspired by the chief. It was a fear which tended constantly to increase as his mental powers and his faculty of imagination advanced. Religion thus obtained an evergrowing hold over him ; and the priest threatened to become master both of chief and people". The priest was originally perhaps the son of a powerful chief whose spirit was deified and whose son or the nearest relative was supposed to be his receptacle. Thus originally kings were also priests. These chiefs with the growth of their power and riches afterwards employed other men to perform the necessary offerings and other services to the spirits. These officers became hereditary and the priestly class of later times. Side by side with this process was the other process by which the epileptic or hysterical man in his fits was supposed to be possessed by the spirit and to be his special receptacle. Such a person is the Saman or the medicine-man of savage races, and the Sanyasi or the God-possessed prophet or incarnated Godman of more civilized races. The frenzied dances and cries of the Saman calculated to bring about fits, probably were the originals of ceremonies and incantations for enforcing the spirit. The spiritual seances for enforcing the attendance of spirits of the

modern spiritualist are the direct outcome of those practices. These practices became popular and the Saman became even more powerful than the chief. When the modern priest makes use of formulas, ceremonials, incantations, laying of hands and the like, he acts only as the descendant and the representative of the old Saman. Among savage races he is still the exorciser of ghosts and spirits of wild animals, tigers crocodiles, snakes &c., and diseases like the small-pox, cholera and fever. Among more advanced nations like the Hindus, Persians and Jews, the priest became a wise man but his brother, the pure magician, continued to exist at the same time, though he and his art were despised by his learned brother. The Pharisees condemned Jesus as merely an exorciser of ghosts and devils by the power of Beelzebub, and Jesus retorted that those priests themselves also exorcised, only with less effect, and asked them by whose power they so exorcised. Among the savage tribes the distinction between the two classes, the regular priests and the exorcisers, did not exist. That distinction came into existence with civilization and the growing contempt of ghostly lore among the learned. But even among civilized nations the learned priest could not wholly divest him of the character of his ancestors, and formulas, incantations, fasts, penances prophecies, blessings, curses, remission of sins and trances still characterized him and he is still the mediator between man and the spirit-god.

The idea of souls going to heaven or hell also proceeds from animism, modified by the growing

sense of the moral law and retributory justice. Worship of the Manes among savages, the elaborate rites of Sraddha among Hindus, sacrifices, fasts and penances and drugging, which had their origin in the desire of the Saman or priest and of saints, male and female, to become receptacles of ghosts of men or spirits of gods and angels, and the resultant prophecies and oracles, all proceed from the same animism. Fetishes, relics, images and pictures of gods, angels and saints are products of the old beliefs of the savages. They are all creatures of the fancy of the savage man stimulated by fear or desire of help from their dead ancestors, transmitted from generation to generation, modified in form from time to time and supported by the arguments of philosophers and learned men, who were all priests and magicians in ancient times. The above conclusions have been arrived at by Tylor after an exhaustive enquiry into the customs of savage tribes and the histories of all nations. Few men have ventured to question the accuracy of the statement of the facts made by him and other modern investigators who agree with him. All these animistic beliefs must be given up. A modern rationalistic writer however truly says that "magic and animism of every sort from devil worship to faith healing, have-perennial sources in human nature." * All these proceed from the conviction, deep ingrained in the constitution of living organisms, of the survival of the spirit. The question of the survival of the conscious

*Read's Natural and Social Morals p.p. 62-26.

self of the living organism has been discussed before. There is every reason to believe that the individual consciousness survives the dissolution of the body. The old beliefs mentioned above have hitherto stood in the way of proper scientific enquiry into the nature of consciousness. Old superstitions must be given up and the enquiry must be conducted on a scientific basis regardless of consequences. With the growth of human reason and goodness, the spiritual essence of individual consciousness will in all probability be made manifest and the spiritual man shall someday be able to demonstrate that Reason and Spirit dominate natural material forces. It is the higher spiritual beings and not the ghosts and hobgoblins inhabiting our fancies from the primitive times, that will someday be apprehended, when man makes sufficient progress in spirituality. In the meantime science will also demonstrate truths showing the power of spiritual forces in man. We have waited long and we may wait a little more.

Next let us go to the modern scientists and investigators again and see what they say of the idea of God. In his *Principles of Sociology*, Herbert Spencer has shown that the spirit originally meant the breath, which destringing man's body was supposed to constitute the surviving part and which attached itself to and became identified with surrounding objects. Then the ghosts came to be called gods and goddesses and to be regarded as lords and spirits of stars, mountains, fire &c. This was the idea of

even the Iranians. "The Fravashes were the ghosts or spirits possessed alike by men and by gods, even by the chief God. The Hebrew. God is habitually spoken of in a parallel way and with the same implication. The Spirit of the Lord has the same meaning."*

The ancient gods were originally ghosts, their burial places were the originals of temples, the idea of sacrifice arose from the sacrifice of beasts and men and other food-offerings on their graves, and altars originated from graves. God originally meant a ghost. Facts of human history can not be controverted by dialectics and we must accept them. But even though all these are true, they do not show that the true God does not exist.

There was no idea of God in the beginning. The idea has developed with reason and goodness and therefore is as true as they and thus truer than the facts of matter. As there was no idea of goodness in the beginning, so the idea of goodness was no part of the idea of God. Spencer says: "The shade of an enemy became a devil and a friendly shade a divinity. Where the conceptions have not developed far, there are no differentiating titles and the distinctions made by us can not be expressed. The early Spanish missionaries in America were inconvenienced by finding that the only native word they could use for God also meant Devil. In Greek *daimon* and *theos* are interchangeable." Indeed originally god was the malevolent ghost. Religion was and is still under-

* Principles of Sociology p. 817.

stood by millions as the worship and propitiation of a god to avert his anger or malevolence or to obtain his favours. Primitive magic was intended to enforce the god. Prayers and formulas, which were and still are considered as the only religious exercises, were a mixture of propitiating the god and enforcing him by magic.*

Hook rightly says that religion among primitive men "born as it was of ignorance and fear had no moral aspect. Indeed in such a purely individualistic age, morality the sense of right and wrong did not exist the sole object of religious ceremonies was the placating of the unseen powers in order to escape the danger their ill will might involve or to secure their help in the special concerns of the individual. These ceremonies performed and the necessary offerings made, the man was entirely free to pursue his own ends unrestrained". From this absolutely unmoral idea of gods was the idea of the God of righteousness evolved.

From the shade of a departed ancestor or friend was evolved the idea of a benevolent god. There was antagonism between friendly and unfriendly shades. Tylor says in his *Primitive Culture*: "rudimentary forms of dualism, the antagonism between a good and evil deity are well-known among the lower races of mankind." He is not right there. Even now among millions of the half-civilized tribes in India, the idea of goodness is not associated with their gods. If Tylor meant that among them there is the idea of a

† *Principles of Sociology* p. 817.

friendly and a malevolent deity, he would be right. From this idea was evolved the idea of a good God and of an evil God, who were always fighting one another. This idea was first evolved among the highly moral Aryans inhabiting the mountains and plains of Central Asia. From them it was borrowed by the Jews and from them by the Christians. Jehova or Allah, the good One, and the evil One, Satan, were the counterparts of Ahura Mazda and Angromainyus of the Iranians. Even among the Aryans, the idea was not easily evolved. There was a great war in consequence of a schism brought about by the priests of the two sets of gods among them. There were many tribes which stuck to the older polytheism by worshipping the Dævas. These Dævas were regarded by the reformers, who were monotheists, as the forces of evil. The reformed religion became the state religion and the emperor of the Iranians enforced it throughout Persia. King Sudasha, chief of the great Aryan tribe Bharata, would not discard the old gods, the Dævas. The Rig Veda tells us how Sudasha and the tribe of Bharata and their priest Vasista, the follower of Vrihaspati with whose name was associated the older cult of the worship of the Dævas and Indra, migrated to India "from a far country", probably after a sanguinary war with the followers of the good Asura in their native steppes in Central Asia,* and how they conquered India and named it as the land of Bharata. The Indian Aryans however, did not

*In the Zend Avesta (Sroasha Yazna) Zoroaster is asked to "attack the flying idolaters, thieves and worshippers of Dævas".

altogether discard Ahura Mazda or the great good and wise God, who was also called Varuna.* The Rig Veda mentions the Asura Varuna as the God of purity and as the searcher of hearts. But the Daevas and their king Indra, the emigrating Aryans in reality worshipped. In time they called their gods Suras and the demons were called Asuras. But even then the moral law proved too strong for them. The struggle between the forces of the good wise god, Ahura Mazda, and the spirits of evil, as a principle, could not be discarded, and they accepted it as the eternal fight between Suras, the good gods, and Asuras, the evil gods. The idea of goodness accompanying the idea of god became a cardinal principle of Hinduism, though it was not insisted on with the grim earnestness of the Persians, till Buddha established his kingdom of righteousness after vanquishing Mara, the god of love and desire, and after establishing his superiority over Indra. In Persia the idea grew and was accepted in all western Asia, which was under it for a long time, and it must be conceded that it was from the Iranian Aryans that the world has learnt the great lesson.

In later Hinduism we do not find the stern insistence upon goodness of the old Iranians. A very popular Sanscrit text says: "I do not know what is good or what is evil. Whatever I am made to do by Thee, O, Lord residing in my heart, I do." With

*"He (Varuna) is the preserver of truth ; He never deceives, He establishes purity in the heart, He is wise and sees all the universe, He destroys those who do not perform good actions". Rig Veda 9th M. 73 S. The first of the angels or the chief characteristic of Ahura Mazda is Vahō Mano or the good mind.

most devout religious men, Hindus or Christians, such sentiments have prevailed. It is the propitious God for whom the devotee cares and not for the good God. The gods are worshipped merely for material favours, and they are thus the Dævas of the Iranians. The Devas and Indra were gods of Power, the very same power, which is now being placed above all things by some modern philosophers. Buddha rated Indra or Sakra and his gods and goddesses at their proper worth. The worshipper of Ahura Mazda, the good wise God, does not care for these gods and goddesses and fights against them. We are always more inclined to worship gods or devils, who we think have power and can give us health and riches, women and power, fame and happiness, than the great good and wise God. We are material and seek material ends, which inevitably lead to decay and death by the laws of matter. The propensity to remain where we are, not to make any effort and to expect some other person to satisfy all our cravings is naturally very powerful. The law which impels us to struggle for the better seems a cruel bond. The bond of moral law has been regarded not only by Lutther but many Christian divines as a curse from which Christ came "to liberate true believers." The quietist and mystical religious men further developed the idea and fancied that when we are possessed by God, we have complete freedom to do as we like. It is the old doctrine of the self arrogating itself to be God in one of its multiform garbs woven by the fancy of philosophers.

Augustine's maxim,—*Dilige et quod vis fac*, if you but love God you may do as you incline—is supposed even by the modern philosopher William James as “morally one of the profoundest of observations”.* But it is clear that the true doctrine is that if you love God you must strive to do as He inclines according to your lights. The spirit is however, slowly evolving in man. The eternal fight, which is being waged in the hearts of all living beings between the forces of the good and the forces of evil *i.e.* the struggle of the living being for being better, is real and not a speculation of philosophers. The spirit is slowly subduing matter, goodness is being slowly evolved out of evil and eternal life out of death. Goodness, reason and eternal life characterize the spiritual. Evil, decay and death characterize the material. There may or may not exist beings of power, who can satisfy our desires for material things or who may hurt or frighten us and extort our submission. But the forces of the spirit alone can give us fearlessness and goodness. They require no lip-worship or offering of flowers or food or hecatombs of bloody sacrifices. They can not be propitiated by magic or repetition of formulas or by forms or symbols. They are the forces of light and of the spirit. We now see only the first rays of goodness and spirit struggling with the darkness of dead matter. Goodness is however being slowly evolved in life. That is a certainty. Fearlessness and freedom will follow. The powers of evil *i. e.*,

* Varieties of Religious Experience p. 80.

matter, fear and death, shall surely be vanquished and the spirit shall rule over them.

Thus inspite of philosophers and religious men, has been the idea of goodness being associated with God. The idea of a God of reason, goodness and mercy is the contrary of a ghost or spirit, who possesses power but who may be either evil or good and who propitiated by offerings or forced by magic favours an individual and oppresses and kills his enemies. Modern European nations and their priests, when they call upon their God to kill their enemies and to give them victory in war, show that they have not yet outgrown the idea inherited from their savage ancestors. The idea of God that is slowly emerging in the consciousness of man is the very contrary of that idea, though it has grown out of it, just as all good in man has grown out of evil, as has been shown before.

Let us now consider what the modern rationalist says of the evolution of the idea of one supreme universal God. Hook says: "with his developing mind, man's religious conceptions were changing. At first every material object was a living thing like himself, possessing similar feelings, similar desires. Then the material objects became distinct from the living things or spirits which dwelt in them. Now (when states and societies had been formed) that he had become one of a widely extended community, so the spirits lost their isolation and independence, and became units in a vast world of spirits just as he observed in his own society the bulk of the people de-

voted to certain tasks, a small number wielding greater power and mainly occupied in self-indulgence, and at the head a supreme chief master of all, so his world of spirits (who wedded and begat other gods) became a like society of inferior spirits with specific duties, and a number of greater spirits headed by one supreme spirit over the unseen world. Just as his own chiefs were given up to carnal pleasures, so were his superior spirits; while the magnificent dwellings of his earthly masters, served by a horde of retainers, repeated themselves in the temples with their swarms of attendant priests" and musicians and dancing women. "It is interesting to observe how man's religious conceptions changed as his own character and institutions changed and the curious way in which through all past ages, the political character of human society is reflected in its ecclesiastical institutions and in its conceptions of the unseen world". *But the idea of one Universal God though it had the abovementioned base origin, is nevertheless true. The reason of man has now attained to such a spiritual stage that it can judge of institutions and human motives of action and thought independently of them as one outside them. The laws of matter and spirit are uniform. The law of progress is one and uniform and it shows that there is one Person through whose influence that law works. But God is the God of the individual and we shall consider the matter later with the idea of self.

The social aspect of the idea of God and religion based on usefulness has been greatly emphasized

*Humanity and its problems.

by many modern philosophers. The facts mentioned by them are undoubted but the conclusions are one-sided and imperfect. William James dilating on the empirical character of God and religion admirably sums up the position thus: "Nothing is more striking than the secular alteration that goes on in the moral and religious tone of men as their insight into nature and their social arrangements progressively develope. After an interval of a few generations the mental climate proves unfavourable to notions of the deity which at an earlier date were perfectly satisfactory: the older gods have fallen below the common secular level and can no longer be believed in. To-day a deity who should require bleeding sacrifices to placate him would be too sanguinary to be taken seriously. Even if powerful historical credentials were put forward in his favour, we would not look at them. Once, on the contrary, his cruel appetites were of themselves credentials. They positively recommended him to men's imaginations in ages when such coarse signs of power were respected and no others could be understood. Such deities then were worshiped because such fruits were relished".

"Doubtless historical accidents always played some later part, but the original factor in fixing the figure must always have been psychological. The deity to whom the prophets, the seers, and devotees, who founded the particular cult, bore witness was worth something to them personally. They could use him. He guided their imagination, warranted their hopes and controlled their will or else they required

him as a safeguard against the evil demon and a curber of other people's crimes. In any case they chose him for the value of the fruits he seemed to them to yield. So soon as the fruits began to seem quite worthless, so soon as they conflicted with indispensable human ideas, or thwarted too extensively other values, so soon as they appeared childish contemptible or immoral, when reflected on, the deity grew discredited and was ere long neglected and forgotten. It was in this way that the Greek and Roman gods ceased to be believed in by educated pagans; it is thus that we ourselves judge the Hindu, Buddhist and Mohammedan theologies. Protestants have so dealt with the Catholic notions of the deity, and liberal Protestants with older Protestant notions; it is thus Chinamen judge of us and that all of us now living will be judged by our descendants. When we cease to admire or approve what the definitions of a deity implies, we end by deeming that deity incredible." Having thus established that our disbeliefs are not consequent on abstract philosophical ideas but are controlled and guided by the prejudices, instinct and commonsense, which make theological partisans of, as whenever they make certain beliefs abhorrent, the author proceeds: "Few historic changes are more curious than these mutation of theological opinion. The monarchical type of sovereignty was, for example, so ineradicably planted in the mind of our forefathers that a dose of cruelty and arbitrariness in their deity seemed positively to have been required by their imagination. They call the cruelty 'retributive justice' and a God

without it would certainly have struck them as not 'soverign' enough. But to-day we abhor the very notion of eternal suffering inflicted; and that arbitrary dealing out of salvation and damnation to selected individuals, of which Jonathan Edward could persuade himself that he had not only a conviction but a 'delightful conviction' as of a doctrine 'exceeding pleasant, bright and sweet, appears to us, if sovereignty anything, sovereignty irrational and mean. Not only the cruelty, but the paltriness of character of the gods believed in by earlier centuries also strikes later centuries with surprise. We shall see examples of it from the annals of Catholic saintships which make us rub our Protestant eyes. Ritual worship in general appears to the modern transcendentalist, as well as to the ultra-puritanic type of mind, as if addressed to a deity of an almost absurdly childish character, taking delight in toy-shop furniture, tapers and tinsel, costume and mumbling and mummery, and finding his 'glory' incomprehensively enhanced thereby; just as on the other hand, the formless spaciouness of pantheism appears quite empty to ritualistic natures and the gaunt theism of evangelical sects seems intolerably bald and chalky and bleak. Luther, says Emerson, would have cut off his right hand rather than nail his theses to the door at Wittenberg, if he had supposed that they were destined to lead to the pale negation of Boston Unitarianism. So far then, although we are compelled, whatever may be our pretensions to empiricism, to employ some sort of our own, whenever we assume to estimate the fruits,

standard of theological probability of other men's religion, yet this very standard has been begotten out of the drift of common life. It is the voice of human experience within us, judging and condemning all gods that stand athwart the pathway along which it feels itself to be advancing. Experience if we take it in the largest sense, is thus the parent of these disbeliefs which were inconsistent with the experimental method. The inconsistency, you see, is immaterial and the charge may be neglected". So far the author is on the firm ground of historical facts but when he goes to positive beliefs he is not so satisfactory. He says: "If we pass from disbeliefs to positive beliefs, it seems to me that there is not even a formal inconsistency to be laid against our method. The gods we stand by are the gods we need and can use, the gods whose demands on us are reinforcements of our demands on ourselves and on one another, what I then propose to do is, briefly stated, to test saintliness by common sense to use human standards to help us to decide how far the religious life commends itself as an ideal kind of human activity. If it commends itself, then any theological beliefs that may inspire it, in so far forth will stand accredited. If not, then they will be discredited, and without reference to any thing but human working principles. It is but the elimination of the humanly unfit, and the survival of the humanly fittest applied to religious beliefs and if we look at history candidly and without prejudice, we have to admit that no religion has ever in the long run established or proved itself in any other way. Religions have

approved themselves; they have ministered to sundry vital needs which they found reigning when they violated other needs too strongly, or when other faiths came which served the same needs better the first religions were supplanted" * I have made this quotation as the truth of the position of the author and the historical evidence in its favour is too strong to be ignored. It is true that man has hitherto worshipped the gods they needed and could use. But slowly the human mind is outgrowing that position. Side by side with the overmastering impulse of having a god according to our need and whom we can use for our purposes, is a stronger but latent instinct that the object of our life is to serve the purpose of an ineffable Power who is evolving higher life. The idea of God which is coming to dominate the human mind is a God whom we need, not for the satisfaction of our lower nature, but to make us better and to enable us in copartnership with Him to evolve the *better* in the universe. The feeling that the Father, the Friend the Co-worker is by his side is always growing on the consciousness of man.

God was at first conceived and worshipped as the family god as we have seen before. From the family god, as the family became a tribe, god became a special god of the tribe. The great Jahva was god of the Jews only. Every race and nation had its peculiar gods, who could not be gods of other races and nations. The Aryan Hindus would not allow even the Hindu Sudras, far less men of other

*Varieties of Religions Experience.

nationalities, to worship their peculiar gods. There was thus absolutely no ideas of God, as we understand the term now, in ancient times. When the great empires were formed the idea of a universal king with numerous dependent chiefs got hold of the mind of man and with it was evolved the idea of a universal God. Even now the idea of a universal emperor and a universal church with one head is popular with many serious men. The idea of a universal God flowed naturally from the idea of a world-emperor. But the idea was really developed by the two proselytizing religions of the world, the Christian and the Mahammadan. The God was originally the god of the tribe and the conquered races alone could worship it in an inferior mode, but foreigners could not worship it. It was St Paul who first conceived the idea that the God of the Jews could be worshipped by the Gentiles. The Jews could not accept the God of the Christians. But many among the Gentiles were willing to accept the gentle Christ as God and the world-empire of Rome naturally gave rise to the idea of a universal God. Mahomet again followed the Christians and wished to convert all the other races of the world and to impose one uniform religion upon all men. Thus was the great and true idea of a universal God, the Father of all, evolved.

Even among Christians and Muhammedans, however religion was not based upon the indispensableness of moral conduct and justice, as modern investigators have amply shown. Buddha alone saw the supreme necessity of goodness but he could find

no God. The idea of a God, of absolute reason, goodness, justice and mercy, the source of the greatest beauty, sweetness, benevolence and love, the supreme individual consciousness, which gives meaning to the individual consciousness of living organisms, as the latter give meaning to inanimate Nature, is slowly manifesting itself, with the evolution of greater reason and higher goodness, in the consciousness of man. What glorious ideas of God will be evolved in future, it is impossible to conceive. The ideas now conceived of Him shall be found to be imperfect and probably false and low in comparison with the glorious ideas of the future, as we have described in previous chapters.

Let us now consider the idea of self.

he idea of
if

Philosophers, ancient and modern, as we have seen before, are divided into two great schools, those that base all morality and religion on the satisfaction of self and those that base their doctrines on absolute unselfishness and desirelessness. Theists of all countries range themselves under the first banner and all atheists, deists and pantheists range themselves under the second. This is a strange result brought about by a false process of thought. The dualistic theist and the pantheist however agree in a surprising manner. The highest expression of the latter as contained in the Upanishadas is "that the Self is dearer than sons and riches and every thing else." The theistic Brahmo of India also recites the text with fervent piety only understanding Self as meaning the Oversoul. The charm of magnifying this little life of ours into Divinity has exerted as

very unholy and `prurient influence on the minds of men, who call themselves philosophers. The idea of the true God is still in the process of being evolved. The lower animals have `very little if any, of that idea. The primitive man was and the modern savage is no better. Atheism or non-appreciation of the idea of the true God was prevalent in ancient times and still rules the minds of men. As light emerged from the primeval darkness, so is the glimmering idea of the true God slowly emerging in the minds of men, which were godless just as the living organisms were blind in the beginning. Philosophers, who still cannot conceive a God outside their little selves, having got a shadowy impression of the existence of the soul or spirit, overvalue their own supposed souls and reconcile the growing idea of God with the old atheism by declaring their own little selves and every thing else to be God. But the denial of sight by creatures in whom the organ is still undeveloped does not at all affect the reality of its existence or of the existence of light. If God is real, there may be a sixth or seventh or a hundredth sense now undeveloped that may apprehend Him or it may be, even the mind of man with his present organs of sense shall in time apprehend Him. What is more probable is that the gradual development and spiritualization of the senses will only make the apprehension of "the light that was neither on land or water" increasingly less difficult.

However that may be, the great Master, Buddha, the truest exponent of human thought, said that these

speculations are useless in freeing us from pain and death which inevitably accompany Life. He however, goes back to the old conflict between self and selflessness. He condemned all speculations about God and self as useless. He was a true seer and did not love dialectics. He said: "This idea of self gives rise to all the sorrows which bind the world as with cords; but having found there is no "I" that can be bound, all these bonds are removed." Who can deny that it is round this consciousness of the Ego that all sorrow and pain have their being and grow. If there is no "I" there is no sorrow. Happiness, says Buddha, is momentary and is followed inevitably by pain and death and thus it should be disregarded by the wise, except as a cause of sorrow.

This idea has pervaded ancient Indian and European philosophy. It is undoubtedly true that consciousness of self is the cause of all sorrow and pain. But remember Descartes' famous axiom. "I am because I think." Remember also what Buddha rightly said that the very origin of thought is the consciousness of Ego and Non-Ego. If the idea of the northern Buddhists be pursued to its logical consequence, the universe of life and thought is a thing evil and painful and should be destroyed and therefore, I would say, I and my thinking should never have come into existence. Why did it come into existence, this evil painful universe? It could not have been allowed to come into existence, if there were a compassionate Buddha or God at the time, who would surely have destroyed it at its inception or never have

allowed it to come into existence at all. If the doctrine is true, there was no compassion in the constitution of the universe at its origin. How did this great compassion find a place in it? There was no virtue, no thought no love but only the fire of life burning this fair universe continually, according to philosophers and also according to modern scientists. How then did they come into existence? The existence of thought and righteousness, morality and love are surely infinitely more inexplicable than the existence of gases and living cells, suns and worlds and men, which are appearing and disappearing on the screen of time, for the momentary amusement of philosophers, who alas, also pass away into the utter darkness of non-existence the moment after.

Egoism or the consciousness of self has been evolved out of absolute want of self-consciousness, science would tell us. Buddha recognized the fact. But he was not aware of the law that the same process evolves higher forms of life. Self-consciousness is the root of pain and he considered it evil and wanted to get rid of it altogether. There is no doubt that pain proceeds from self-consciousness. There is also the fact that pain causes the evolution of the senses, the mind, goodness and the higher forms of life. With the progress of life, this egoism or self-consciousness is assuming finer forms. Will it arrive at a stage when pain may not be necessary for the evolution of the higher life? It is possible that at the stage when reason will dominate life, trouble and labour will be undergone willingly at its bidding.

But still the pain of decay and death will remain. The consciousness of self and, with it, selfishness will in course of time undergo a great change. Selfishness will be purified and glorified by the higher consciousness of self that shall be evolved. The self shall remain but it shall be a glorified and purified noble and great self. It is not to be the universal Self or God. Let nobody make the mistake which leads to the negation of all that is good and noble, to the negation of virtue, morality progress and God.

Unlike the philosophers, who have followed him at a distance with their theories about self and desire and selflessness and desirelessness, Buddha saw deeper into the realities of things. He said that the consciousness of the Ego itself is evolved from the impression of past existences. Indeed the consciousness of the Ego has been like all senses and sensations evolved by the process of evolution from the all but inanimate unfeeling living cell to the fully developed man. The consciousness of the Ego will be still further developed and it is difficult to say what form it will take in future. The self-consciousness of an insect is not the same mental condition as the self-consciousness of a highly cultured sensitive man. Without the "I" there is certainly no pain or sorrow but without the "I" there is no existence. Without the "I" there can also be no progress and no "Buddha", or the enlightened One. Without desire, without pain, without egoism, no progress is possible and the glorious animate universe burns to ashes, indeed is more effectually burnt to

ashes than by the fire of desire which the philosophers very clearly and truly found was existing and burning all living beings. But all pains are naught in comparison with the glorious forms that are being evolved by them. The pain of egoism and the fires of desire are surely burning the world of life but like gold it is being burnt and transmuted into more glorious forms.

Pain and death, the sacrifice of the individual, are necessary ingredients for the progress of Life. Look at the pain and the misery of your fellow-creatures. Is not life well given away, if a hundredth part of it can be alleviated thereby? Have we not witnessed the sight of millions of ordinary human beings willingly sacrificing their lives in war for the glory of their nations? The sacrifice of self has come to be considered by civilized man as a matter of very little consequence when compared with the general good. Indeed, a man is considered disgraced if he is not prepared for it, if he thinks much of it. This high level of morality was reached in the twentieth century. What higher levels, will be reached in succeeding centuries who can say. To make much of this little self, to say this little self is the centre of all action and is the very God himself, is ridiculous in the extreme. The matter is not worth a minute's thought at this age. Let all base men be engaged in that discussion. All advanced societies and governments and all noble men would without scruple require the sacrifice of the individual for the good of

the many and even enforce it against the base men who would be reluctant to make it. It is now an axiom, of ordinary social life that self is nothing in comparison with the common good and society is justified in demanding and enforcing compliance with it. Sacrifice of self has come to be considered as a matter of little importance and absolutely necessary for the maintenance of society, like the payment of municipal taxes.

It is no doubt a small matter this sacrifice of the self in the eyes of higher social laws and of the new ethics. But to the individual, self shall always remain the object of paramount interest. If the individual now sacrifice himself without thinking much of the act for the common good, it only shows that the idea of the good, is higher than all other motives of life. Even when sacrificing his life, the individual cannot but feel that he is obeying a call higher than the call of his little life. There are great philosophic theists also, who consider that the individual life ends with the body and its only purpose is the furtherance of the public good. But remember that during the last great war European nations willingly sacrificed hundreds of thousands of the noblest of their race for what, one side considered good and the other unmitigated evil. We are not thus sure that what we consider good is really good. It is the desire to sacrifice one's all for what he considers the good that is noble. Thus all nobleness, all ethics, all that is good are centred in the self. The self is thus of paramount importance. The connection between this self and the source of all goodness must therefore be very intimate.

The material forces and modes of motion like light produce the eye but without the eye, light as light has no existence. Pure form is a spiritual entity. It is upon the visual perception of form that the existence of light depends. Indeed the entire glorious phenomenal universe of form and color and beauty and sound and music has no existence apart from the sense-perceptions of the self-conscious individual. Lotze was surely right when he said that "the world without a conscious subject is a world waiting for its meaning". Stirling also has truly said: "all that is going on, all these globes are whirling in a darkness blacker than the mouth of the wolf, deeper than the deepest pit that even man has sunk * * soundless and more silent than the void of voids * * but for an eye and an ear and a soul behind it." * The self is naught without the forces of dead matter and there is no phenomenal nature without self. Who will explain the mystery? Life is a phenomenon, which is the result of a combination of spirit and matter. It is the mysterious bridge which connects the limitless ocean that separates matter and its contrary, spirit. God is probably the pure spirit, but He is higher and purer and better than any idea we can have of Him. But this is clear that without Him this mysterious connection between self and phenomena, between matter and spirit is inexplicable.

It has been shown before that it is the individual which gives meaning to the entire universe. But

*Philosophy and Theology p 78.

what gives meaning to the individual existence ? If there were stars and trees and flowers, earth, rivers, mountains, plains and oceans and all kinds of irrational animals, and only one single immortal man wandering on the earth like the wandering Jew, what meaning would he find in his life ? The Buddhist, the Hindu Yogee or the Vedantist would consider the state blessed. He would be God, free from pain, free from death and disease and old age. None of them, Bhikkus, Sanyasis or Christian monks, have escaped pain, disease, old age and the pangs of death. Solitary blessedness is desirable only to the insane animal, as we find in nature. The universe is an illusion, according to the Hindu, and according to the Buddhist, it is a false painful impression brought about by ignorance, the removal of which is blessedness and therefore, this universe of colour and sound, sense and mind, mercy and goodness, is absolutely meaningless. It is further clear that to the solitary man all matter and irrational animals will not afford much meaning to his life. A rational animal is a social being. The society of his fellows and work for them and with them make life tolerable to him—indeed give some meaning to his life. The first companion man seeks is the woman by the primal instinct of the propagation of the species. That instinct the lower animals have. Some organisms die as soon as the work of propagation is done. The company of the mate for the propagation of the species will afford no sufficient meaning to life. Brothers next come and stand by you, and you and they combine in self-protection

against enemies. So do herds of buffaloes, elephants, ants and wasps. Even that association will not give meaning sufficient to his life to man. Search after truth and ideas may give occupation to the scientist or the philosopher but would still afford no sufficient meaning for his existence to him. Philanthropists may employ their time in relieving the distress of the fellows and leaders of Parliaments may devise measures for the amelioration of pain and progress of the members of their Society or State, but still would find no sufficient meaning for their existence. Association with one's fellows gives some meaning to life and makes it to some extent bearable but gives no sufficient or absolute meaning to it. Life's meaning is in reference to some person or persons and things, notwithstanding the philosophers who speculate on solitary blessedness. What we find is that interest in life increases with the evolution of the higher forms. The interest felt by man in life is greater than the beast. The civilized and cultured man has more to interest him than the savage. A philosopher finds more to interest him than an ignorant person. The objects which interest an angel or God if such beings exist, must be more and their interest in life greater than that of man. There is something in this interest in life which is always growing and becoming more universal and spiritual, which is an ingredient of life itself. If we admit that the life of a rational person has a real, sufficient and absolute meaning, it must be in reference to some person, real and not imaginary,

which is universal and utterly spiritual. I call that some person God. He gives a rational and sufficient meaning to the life of a beast or tree, as distinct from lifeless matter, to the life of man, as distinct from the beast, to the life of the angel, as distinct from man, to the life of gods as distinct from angels. I do not know the real nature of that which gives life to the individual. But as the whole universe is meaningless without the individual, seeing, hearing, feeling, thinking and loving, so the entire assembly of individual lives has no meaning without another individual in comparison to whom man is but dead matter. As there is an indissoluble and innate connection between light and seeing so there is an indissoluble and innate connection between the seeing individual and Him or it, by whom, through whom or in whom, this connection is brought about. This entity is over and above and infinitely superior to unfeeling, unthinking nature and also to the thinking, feeling entity, man. That entity is an individual for without an individual the whole universe is meaningless. But he is such an individual as gives meaning to all other individuals, just as the latter give meaning to the phenomena of inanimate matter. The graduated scale of existence in nature is from absolutely unconscious dead substance to more and more self-conscious entities. The consciousness of self gives meaning and thus reality to the unconscious matter. The evolution of the higher species and that of greater and keener self-consciousness go together. The latter is probably the cause of the former. In any case they are concomitants of one another.

Therefore for the progress of life, by a law of nature, greater individuality, a larger and keener consciousness of self, is necessary. The loss of individuality or self-consciousness is reduction to meaningless dead matter. Nature had mollified her cruel rule of the stronger devouring the weaker by the law that generally the devoured has less self-consciousness and thus less feeling of the pain of destruction. The higher the animal, the greater is its pain at destruction of its individual existence. Greater pain accompanies higher life. Unless cruel unfeeling pain is the governing law of the universe, as Buddha thought, this law must cease to have full operation at a certain stage of life. Pain is necessary for the evolution of the higher life. A stroke of the hammer upon a piece of metal is productive of little sensation in the latter. But it gives great pain to the more self-conscious beast and infinitely greater pain to the much more self-conscious organism man. Intensity of the pain depends on the intensity of the consciousness of self. The pain is in Nature for the purpose of evolving higher life. Its intensity does not depend on the greatness of the cause but on the intensity of the self-consciousness of the living being affected. Progress however of the living organism does not imply evolution of greater pain. It means greater intellect, higher goodness, greater mercy, keener love and greater happiness on the whole. With the lower organisms, the sources of happiness are much less, as pain is also much less. With the absolutely unconscious entity there is equilibrium of pain and plea-

sure. With the evolution of higher life, the balance inclines in favour of happiness and against pain. Thus it is going on in life. Reason will in time be the predominant element in life. With the advancement of reason, the fanciful terrors and avoidable pains will disappear. But decay, old age and death will still remain. The pain of parting with the dear ones will be keener and the pain of death will be more keenly felt, because of greater self-consciousness. But reason will then fight feeling for the alleviation of pain. When reason will predominate and feeling assume the glorified shape, reason will force it to assume, pain will remain only to give a meaning to happiness till life attains perfection.

We have seen that it is the self-conscious individual that gives meaning to matter and to the unconscious. Dead matter has a meaning to life at its lowest stage. The vegetable world has a great meaning to beasts. If the evolution of the higher species is a law of nature. The lower species is necessary and has a deep meaning in reference to the higher species. If there were no higher species evolvable from lower species even the life of the highest organisms, gods and angels, would be absolutely meaningless and stale as Buddha rightly pointed out. Man gives more interest to the beast than it would possess without him. Gods and angels if they exist would give more meaning to the life of man than it would otherwise possess. The less self-conscious have their full meaning, in prefer

ence to the more self-conscious organisms with senses and reason and goodness better developed. Thus this universe of matter has meaning in reference to self-conscious imperfect finite life, in which the material *i. e.* the unconscious ingredient prevails. The universe of this imperfect life, self-conscious but still having in it the ingredient of unconsciouness, can have full meaning only in reference to the perfectly self-conscious individual whom I call God.

The lower organisms are devoured by higher organisms and a part of the meaning of their existence is in reference to the latter. It is to be observed that the greater intelligence of the higher animals is instrumental in evolving greater intelligence in the lower animals oppressed by them. Buddha said that men are food for the gods. Man's existence is probably necessary for the full meaning of the life of angels and gods, if there be any. They however, Buddha suggested, make use of man for their selfish pleasures as man makes use of the lower animals. Is there no one whose love of living beings is not tinged with self-love? All life is crying day and night without ceasing to such a One. Does He exist? If He does not, we are but food of bacillii, beasts and gods and had better not exist. Let us consider the matter further. There is no necessity in nature for an unconscious immanent God of absolute reason and all the other absolute perfections, in whom there is no individuality. It gives no meaning to the individual self-conscious living being or to unconscious dead matter. There is an absolute necessity in the universe for

the Individual in reference to whom the imperfectly self-conscious and the wholly unconscious have meaning.

Out of the ideas of form, light and sight, sound and music come into existence, according to Buddha's law. Science tells us that light evolves sight and from sight is evolved the glorified works of Art, that ether-vibrations produce the ear and from hearing is produced glorious music. From material life is also produced glorified reason, from falsehood, truth, from cruelty, mercy, from murder of the old, ascetism, and from self-love is evolved the glorified self-less love out of which the individual sacrifices itself. Pure matter has no self-consciousness. Imperfect life is matter and spirit so mixed up that it is difficult to say that it is not wholly matter, Its spiritual character is manifested in its self-consciousness. The lower forms of life have less and the higher forms greater self-consciousness. So far as living being are self-conscious, they give a meaning to dead unconscious matter and nature. So far as they are not conscious, they are matter and they can have a meaning only in reference to a higher Individual. Thus the Being who is perfectly self-conscious and is therefore wholly spiritual, gives meaning to the world of life, the self-consciousness of which is imperfect and mixed up with matter. He alone gives meaning to the living and to the non-living. He is the source of the Idea and the Form with which the coming into existence of light and other vibrations, the eye and the ear, sight and hearing, art and music, is indissolubly connected. Some philosophers consi-

der that pure ideas are God and spirit. Ideas are however no better than dead matter. They, too, though partaking of the spiritual, have no existence and are meaningless without the self-conscious individual. The perfect Individual is more spiritual than idea, than reason, than goodness. He is so connected with these all-but spiritual entities as ideas are with the senses.

Again a man, who has had all the pleasures and the honours and have probed all the springs of life, finds nothing of lasting interest in it without God. Buddha and all the philosophers, with the exception of a few who have given no sufficient reason for holding the contrary, have all found and declared that individual life, with all the enthusiasms and pleasures of youth, with all the magnificent feast of sense and reason supplied by nature, is nothing but sorrow and has no real interest and in the end is characterized by a pitiful clinging to material life wholly ignoble. The interest in life is supplied by the seeking after food and sexual enjoyment and the gratification of the other senses, and the seeking after knowledge, friendship, love and the happiness of others. Every rational man has found that all these in time flag in their interest. Lasting interest in life is not supplied by them. The greatest of optimistic idealists have felt it. Goethe wrote at the age of seventy-five: "I will say nothing against the curse of my existence. But at bottom it has been nothing but pain and burden." Even optimistic philosophers and saints who were

devout worshipers of God felt likewise. Luther when he had grown old wrote: "I am utterly weary of life. I pray the Lord will come forthwith and carry me hence * * Rather than live forty years more, I would give up my chance of paradise." Tolstoy at the age of fifty wrote: "I felt that something had broken within me on which my life had always rested, that I had nothing left to hold on to and that morally my life had stopped. Behold me then, a man happy and in good health hiding the rope in order not to hang myself to the rafters of the room where every night I went to sleep alone. * * All this took place at a time when so far as all my outer circumstances went, I ought to have been completely happy, I had a good wife who loved me and whom I loved good children and a large property which was increasing with no pains on my part. I was more respected by my kinsfolk and acquaintance than I had ever been. I was loaded with praise by strangers, and without exaggeration I could believe my name already famous. Moreover I was neither insane nor ill. I could mow as well as the peasants. I could work with my brain eight hours uninterruptedly and feel no bad effects." But with all this testimony of the great notwithstanding, life has got a lasting, a perennial interest. What supplies that interest? I call it God. It is the relationship to Him, His company, the association with Him, His service and His love that give meaning and interest to life. If there is no lasting interest in life, nothing matters to the living individual and suicide when youth and powers of enjoyment

flag as some great philosophers and scientists have suggested, * is the truest wisdom.

The nature of the relationship of the imperfect individual to God is deserving of further consideration. We have already seen that since the earliest times the only idea of God which man has held is that of a supernatural being of power, able and willing to help one who propitiates Him with offerings of food or blood or by physical privations like fasts or by adulations and pitiful appeals called prayers for procuring health, wealth, women, children, power and fame. The desire of man to be freed of the ills of life has made him conceive gods able to help him. The gods were thus manufactured by man not only with wood and stones and metals by processes denounced by Isaiah, but also by the imagination and fancy of man. The Jewish prophets when they conceived of a special God of the Jews residing in their great temple, to whom great hecatombs of burnt offerings were made by them for propitiating Him, also were guilty of the process of manufacturing a God delighting in cruel slaughter of poor beasts and birds in thousands. All men, Hindus, Christians and Muhammadans, make gods of their own, whom they worship. "God made man according to His own image" is a cardinal article of faith with many. It is truer to say that man made his God according to his own image. He fancies a god, like his own self, only a bigger self possessing greater power and willing to help him specially. It is reminiscent of

God made
after the im-
age of man.

* Huxley has put down in his *Reflections*, and that was the opinion of many ancient philosophers, that suicide is good when the powers of life flag.

the savage belief that the dead ancestor is the god who is always willing to help his descendants. The idea of God consists of two elements, first the possession of supernatural power, and the second, His taking a special interest in the worshipper on account of some relationship. Man has been manufacturing his God and is still manufacturing him according to his own inclinations. Only the philosophers rejecting the idea of a personal God have been to some extent free from the reproach, but they have gone to the other extreme and conceived their own glorified and purified selves as God or parts of God. They, like the believers in a personal God, have also made God after the image of man. Even the most acute of philosophers imagined only such a God to exist as proved their theories. Kant postulated 'a rational God in the interests of science' and Balfour "a moral God in the interests of morality", forgetful of the base origin of reason and morality and forgetful that God exists not only in the interests of reason and morality and other entities higher than they but in the interests of what is the highest, the noblest, the purest, the most beautiful, the most lovable and the eternally interesting..

The idea of their utter helplessness before the forces of nature, against sorrow, decay and death is ingrained in the life of all organisms and they are always stretching forth their hands in space for a Helper. This natural impulse has made man to manufacture one or many supernatural beings of power, able and willing to help him. Sacrifices, fasts, pilgrimages, rituals, temples and churches have

engrossed the mind of man. Man in his search for one able to help him in the inevitable sorrows of his life and against death, in his search for continued happiness, has manufactured gods. But slowly the spiritual idea that there is something better than happiness and freedom from sorrow is gaining ground in the mind of man and he is feeling that his conceptions of God, the powerful helper only, are fanciful. But even if all the images and ideas of God now entertained by us be all but nearly false and based only on our desire for protection or help, there is still a substratum of truth in them. The manufactured gods so vividly portrayed by Isaiah could not help their devotees, nor could the God of Isaiah and the other Jewish prophets save the Jews. In many countries, devout worshippers of gods, when any serious calamity befalls them notwithstanding sacrifices, fasts, prayers and tears, cast away their images into rivers in disgust or punish them. Many modern philosophic persons, when they find that God does not hear their prayers, likewise discard Him altogether. Every one considers that God is his special God willing to help him against all other persons and against the laws of nature.

No wonder that many rational minds deny God altogether. Such ideas of God are all but wholly untrue and must be given up. But they are not wholly untrue, for they are based upon an eternal principle of life as we shall presently see.

Man is slowly dominating the material in him and perceiving that there is something better than happi-

ness and freedom from pain. The boy grown up to manhood considers the pains of study, so galling to youth, as real happiness for which he yearns and unfortunately can not get back. This lesson applies in all the phases of life. As our ideas of mercy grow, we discard a god, who would only help us against all others. We will not have such a special God for the misery and destruction of all but ourselves. As reason and art grow in us, we will not have a god, who would destroy the laws which have evolved this glorious orderly universe, for the sake of our little selves. As the idea of goodness develops in us, we find that the Good One is infinitely better and higher and mightier than the powerful One or the Daeva, who would help us. Thus a new and a truer idea of God is evolving in the consciousness of man, which is based on reason and true philosophy.

The instinct
that makes
man to make
gods is true.

But it must be conceded that all this excellent idea of the God of reason, mercy and goodness has proceeded out of the ideas of gods, which something inherent in our nature made us entertain. Man has stretched forth his hands in space and cried for help from cradle to death, from his savage state to the state of the modern scientist or philosopher. Why should he have done so, if something inherent in life did not impel him to believe that there was a helper? We find in nature that the cry of helpless life is answered. The crying new-born babe stretches forth its hands in space and finds the teats of the mother's breast. If there is a God, He is surely the personal God, Who answers the prayer of every one of His

children. The facts of all life show that all organisms are absolutely helpless at birth and would die immediately, if nature had not in anticipation of their birth provided for the needs for the continuance of life. Neither the father nor the mother had any idea of such needs. They had no wish to provide for them. Nature made the mother her instrument for saving life. The stretching forth of the hands by the new-born babe for the teats and its getting them filled with milk at that very moment is an astonishing fact of nature, a miracle more stupendous than the miracle of the loaves and fishes ascribed to Jesus. Life begins with a miracle. We find in every stage of its growth that its indispensable needs are supplied by nature through unwilling agents in a manner equally miraculous. Now, my position is that the growth of the spiritual—of reason, art, goodness, mercy and love—is the effect of the natural course of the evolution of life from its all but material stage to its purely spiritual stage. But the present life must be preserved and the material needs of life for its preservation must be supplied. The search for sensual pleasures and satisfaction of self are instincts in life which preserve it. But living beings are impelled by some law to undergo labour, hardship and misery for the evolution of a higher life. It is admitted by materialistic philosophers that nature by herself is unreasoning, unfeeling, cruel and unethical. The living being is not compelled by nature to seek the higher life. Nature is concerned only with the preservation of life and the struggle for existence. The living animal also would not willingly undergo the troubles neces-

sary for obtaining a higher life. The boy would not willingly undergo the labour of study. Running about, playing and eating are the occupations prescribed for him by nature and they do greater good to his physical body than the hard discipline of labour or study. He struggles and cries when he is compelled to give them up and to submit to that discipline. A poor child of ten is sometimes obliged to go to the hard work of a factory to provide for the needs of its sick mother, a poor working woman unable to work. It has to learn the lesson of love and sacrifice early. Nature protests against it. Its own inclinations are absolutely against it. Some Power above all nature, above all the gods of mere power and above all life, compels it to adopt the disagreeable laborious course of love and sacrifice. Prayer for all the indispensable needs of life are answered in a manner unexplained and inexplicable by the laws of Nature. Life however means the evolution of the spirit from matter or from an all but material form. The process must be painful and laborious to the material portion of life, for it leads to its destruction. The all but material living organism is powerless to undergo it—more powerless than the new-born animal. Some merciful Power is always helping it in its desire and its struggle not only for the preservation of the material part of its life but in its struggle to free itself from the fetters of matter and to realize its true life. The cry of pain of the new-born babe is answered by the coming of the milk in the breast of the mother. The cry of grown-up man at anxiety

sorrow, pain and death may similarly be heard by a merciful Power and answered by securing his higher life. We know very little of the ways of the spirit or of the mode in which it is evolved. We know however this much that there is every reason to hope. We shall know better and better, as life progresses.

Again we know that a man with a pistol or an angry evil spirit, if there be any such, is more powerful than an inoffensive good man. The tiger is more powerful than the lamb. But we also find the powers of the strong and the mighty are being slowly mastered by reason. Surely strength and power are indispensable for the evolution of the Good. Without them the good could not come into existence nor can there be progress. They are the very foundation of life. But they are being dominated and harnessed by reason for her uses. We find also that reason is the very foundation and base of goodness. It is reason that gives birth to it. But it is also a fact that the merely intellectual person is being slowly mastered by goodness. Is not the call of mercy becoming stronger in man than brute destroying power and its associate reason? What is there in reason that enables it to dominate the overwhelming powers of the material universe with its inexorable laws? What is there in goodness and mercy which enable them to dominate both the powers of cruel unreasoning nature and also cold calculating self-seeking reason? We are only on the fringe of the realm of spirit. Its laws and

powers are unknown and undreamt of now. Some eminent scientists now suggest that electricity or electrons are the base of matter. Scientists of the future may suggest some still more subtle force or element as the root of atoms and molecules. Mesmeric or magnetic force in living organisms may furnish another basis. In the course of the investigation of subtle forces, it would not be surprising to find will power furnishing another basis or a dominant factor in the material universe. This will of man strangely acknowledges the dominion of reason. Reason again in a still more astonishing manner acknowledges the supremacy of goodness and mercy. Thus we find power and strength, gravitation which makes worlds and suns exist and move with force so terrific as is beyond the imagination of man, electricity, which is more powerful than gravitation, mesmerism, magnetism, the energy latent in atoms and the power in the will of living organisms upon which this universe of matter and sense is based, all this manifestation of force and power is dominated by ever progressing reason and by the still indefinite and subtler goodness and mercy, which are manifesting themselves in nobler and nobler forms with the progress of life. The real bases of the eternal in life are still but little known. There is nothing to differentiate between material force and life, if life be like the motion produced in a wire by electricity or like a talking or a calculating machine. Life partakes both of matter and of the spirit. So far as it is material it is evanescent. So far as it is, spiritual, it is eternal. The eternal element is the *real*

paramount basis of life. We have seen that by some impelling merciful power, nature, cruel and merciless, is obliged against her own inclination to provide for the means for the the preservation of life when an organism is absolutely helpless and also to provide for such of its needs as are necessary for its growth. The needs of the spiritual element in life are it may be surmised, provided for by the same merciful Power. What are the needs of the spirit, what conduces to its growth, are still unknown to us. Here on the analogy of the phenomena manifested in material nature in regard to life, we may believe that whatever happens to living beings conduces to the growth of the spirit. As glorious sight is evolved out of sightlessness, so the evil in life is by a process absolutely miraculous though simple, is transmuted to good, as we have seen before. Pain leads to happiness. Unreason and cruelty are transmuted to glorious reason and mercy. Thus our life acknowledges the influence of a Power ineffable, outside itself. Even the lowest of organisms feels that there is a helper and stretches forth its hands in the void space for help and finds such help in its real needs for the growth of the spirit. Man manufactured gods out of that instinct. The gods and religions may be fanciful, but the instinct that produces them is real and true. The Helper is there. So far as we look for help from the gods possessing material power without regard to goodness, we are not near the true God. So long as we worship the spiritual God for material things not ne-

cessary for our life, our worship is false and our prayers are often unanswered. We are yet incapable of worshipping the purely spiritual God and we naturally worship gods of our own making and are disappointed when our prayers are apparently unanswered.

But what is stated above may be construed as leading to the position that man, imperfect and mostly material as he is, can never worship the true God and can have no apprehension of any relationship with Him. That is the position of the agnostic, in which the undefined and undefinable spirit is substituted for the undefined and undefinable unknown God. In that case there can be no religion. If man can go to his God only when he becomes spiritual, all his cries in distress and grief are in vain, there is no Helper and no Comforter. God is the source and the upholder of the law which evolves the spiritual in life. This is considered utterly noble, true and satisfying by many philosophic theists as well as by agnostics. They consider the ideas of a personal God, who overrules the laws of nature to help a living being as ignoble and untrue. But the philosophers, apart from their books, have often been in their conduct very sorry specimens of moral beings. Man's life repudiates their grandiloquent words.

In all living beings who are imperfect, weak and helpless, an overmastering instinct tells them that there is a helper and a comforter outside themselves and outside the laws of cruel nature by which they

are oppressed. Philosophy cannot abolish the crying and the stretching forth of the hands into void space of the newborn babe. One little fact is worth a thousand speculations. All life is unceasingly crying to an unseen Helper. All life is convinced that there is a Helper, otherwise how is it possible that it should by a natural instinct *i. e.*, by the very laws of its being, stretch forth its hand in the void for succour in distress? Habit and experience may account for the act in the case of grown-up men but not in the case of newborn babes. The instinct is ingrained in life. Looking up for help to another when one can help himself is against the nature of all animals. We do not find it in the lower animals. In man alone we find that an unnatural habit of crying for help and depending on others is sometimes acquired by the indolent and worthless. The able-bodied beggars swarm in eastern countries. In advanced communities, the habit is not unknown. Man alone among animals can by piteous appeals induce his fellows to help in his idleness. Other animals do not attempt it. The law of nature is that a living organism receives help necessary for the preservation and growth of his life and as soon as the immediate object is served the helping hand is withdrawn. All life is intended by the merciful Lord to work out its own progress. That is the law we find in nature. The grown-up beast gives up the teats and runs about and gets food for itself. In the case of man the helping hand is required longer and in many more ways. Man has to be trained in arts,

literature science, philosophy &c. Nevertheless he must work out his own progress. He receives help when it is indispensable and only so much of it as is necessary for equipping him for exerting for further progress.

Three facts of paramount importance to life appear from what has been stated above : (1) the passive goodness and purity and the active justice, mercy and benevolence, as well as reason and freedom, which partake of the character of both active and passive virtues, are more potent than matter and mere force and power ; (2) the spiritual element is, the real life of beings, which by much labour and exertion, through much pain and suffering, shake off the material element in their constitutions which drag them down to evil, brute force, cruelty, grossness, unreason and death ; (3) the living organism is helpless at birth and cries out for help and its cry is answered by a merciful power outside material nature and as it grows up its cries to be helped up from the plateau, in which it finds itself, to the next higher plateau and a merciful power hears its cry and helps it to climb up the height but leaves it, when the higher stage is reached, to travel forward of his own free will and power, till the next height unsurmountable by its own efforts is reached, when again it receives the help of the same unknown power. Thus it goes on till the perfect spiritual life is evolved. Living organisms cry out in vain for help when it is necessary that through their own efforts they should strengthen

themselves by walking up the valley unaided in labour and pain.

In the onward march of progress from one stage to the next higher stage, we meet with the merciful helping hand when we are powerless and helpless to ascend the height or to cross the unfathomable chasm which bars our way from one stage to another. But in the meantime in this long and weary journey, in our troubles and pains, is there no manifestation of the love of the Lord of life beyond the general laws and the common glories and pleasures supplied by nature? Do we never experience the loving touch and hear the word of comfort, just as the toiling boy feels the loving hand of the mother on his head or hears the word of encouragement from his father? If there is a Father, surely we ought to have such experience. I believe every living being has such experience, though he does not know that it is from the "everlasting God who sleepeth not" and who is his father and mother. But what proof, what evidence is there for such belief and for such assertion? Where is the great benefactor, the master, the saviour, who will give us the necessary proof? But with our little mind and undeveloped spirit we may consider the question, ponder over the great problem of problems, which when solved, would make man free from all fear, free from pain and sorrow for all time.

Now, if man were sure that the almighty God was with him and loved him better than a father or mother, all fear, all pain, all anxiety and all sorrow

would cease and with them, all impetus to exertion would also cease and life would be stationary. The lord, Who is evolving spirit from matter, out of His love therefore conceals himself from His children, though He is always with them. We surely do not know that He is with us, for that would ensure a stationary condition and mean our permanent degradation and undoing for all time. But we cannot but yearn after such knowledge. We cannot help pondering over it.

We know the very first experience we have in life is when as babes we cry out and the milk comes into the breast of the mother, who notwithstanding her own helpless condition takes us up and fondles and gives us the milk for which we cry. The same mother, if we were lower animals, would cast us out when we grew up. What then was the cause of this temporary overpowering love? It was not in the mother before and it disappeared from her heart after a time. There is no love in dead cruel nature. Whose touch was that, whose fond soothing voice was that, whose was that great overpowering love which would make the mother even of a beast sacrifice her own life at that short period of time for her offspring without a thought of her own self? The unknown Mother hides herself from us but that touch, that voice and that love do not belong to any person, man or angel or god or to material nature. We do not know to whom they belong. We experience them and never can know with certainty their source. That is the

very nature of progressive life. Is the first experience mentioned above of life its last ? At every stage of life we come across such experience. It is not the great minds, the virtuous people or the rich and the prosperous, who alone have such experience. The weak, the lowly, the distressed, the down-trodden, they who have no education, whose daily labour for bread leaves them no leisure to think of the great problem, all have the sweet experience.

Without such help from some Power outside our little selves and outside dead cruel nature, preservation and progress of life are not possible nor do I think man or beast would cling to this utterly low miserable life without the certainly in the inmost subliminal consciousness of the experience of the love of the Helper. I cannot say more on the subject. I am not competent to do so. There will be men, with intellect and spirituality, of which I have little idea, men, who shall have suffered and enjoyed and toiled greatly more than I have done and who shall have known the springs of life and the facts and laws of nature greatly more, who will some day demonstrate that like the very first experience of life, when the crying newborn baby gets the mother's milk, there are thousands of such unexplained and inexplicable experiences of the Love ineffable in every step of this ignoble life of ours. For the present it is sufficient to know that we have every reason to hope.

There are great philosophers who dilate on the glories of a God, who acts only through the grand

machinery of the laws of the Universe, and consider any other idea of God as ignoble and therefore false. There is much to be said for this position. But it never really satisfied these great men, as we find from the accounts of their conduct in life. Much less can such ideas satisfy humbler men like us. We are weak, helpless and distressed and oppressed by these grand but cruel laws, and we cry in despair to the unknown Father to rescue us from being ground down to nothingness by the two eternally revolving millstones, the earth and the sky, as is expressively described by a great seer and poet. The laws of material nature are inviolable in the material plane, for matter is wanting in freedom. We do not know however, the nature of the Spirit or its laws. We cannot therefore say how it works and whether it can override the laws of matter. The one great law of matter is that it obeys the Spirit. The apparently miraculous divine interposition of Providence in favour of an individual, if such a phenomenon ever happens, may be strictly in accordance with natural laws unknown to us, which enable the subtle spiritual force in nature to influence the material forces known to us. Some miraculous phenomena are vouched for by unquestionably honest men. They may not be more miraculous than wireless telegraphy. The great God, upon whom this glorious universe of law and order depends, surely does not stultify the Law. But it may be considered consistent with that Law, for Him to help the individual, though apparently such special interposition may seem inconsistent with the laws of dead nature.

•

The laws of the individual are little known. The stories of prophets like Daniel, Isaiah, Jesus, St. Paul, St. Francis, Chaitanaya, Tulsidas and the mystical saints too numerous to mention, of India and Europe, positive science have not yet authenticated nor accounted for. There they remain. To every serious-minded religious man, phenomena have occurred, which the ordinary physical laws known to him cannot explain. Clairvoyance, telepathy, spiritulism and theosophy, with their manifold mystic theories, may be false or they may explain some day the phenomena mentioned above. But the existence of superior spiritual entities, which some of these phenomena tend to show, can not be explained by the material laws of magnetism and the like nor by the spiritualistic occurrences, which though called spiritual are wholly material when analysed. The law of the Spirit is not material, though it governs matter and is its life and moving power. Matter might blindly move in a chaos of destruction. But the evolution of order, progress, intellect, ethics, of the Spirit in short, is beyond its scope. The rule of true ethics, the pursuit of virtue for virtue's sake, matter cannot account for. The sacrifice of the individual life for the progress of the many, no material law can explain.

The spiritual law governing life.

The spirit of willing sacrifice, out of love of some body, some thing or some principle, is growing in life, and the spirit of Christ, as understood by modern advanced Christianity, symbolizes it. I prefer to believe that that spirit is the spirit of the son

who is well-beloved and to agree with St. Paul when he says :” And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying. Abba Father.”* This spirit is a miracle which the laws of matter will not explain. There is a moving power, in the universe which is wholly beyond matter. It is wonderful to behold the miracles of the immaterial ethical laws, the miracles of sacrifice and love, which have led to progress, greater purity, greater beauty, greater intellect and greater love in human society. These miracles are more stupendous than the miracles of Christ and Chaitanya, which are not accepted by positive science. These stupendous miracles cannot be denied and are accepted by materialists, because they fancy that they conform to some general law. But they forget that general law in outside matter, outside even such all-but-immaterial matter, electricity, magnetism and other, and outside all physical nature.

If these miracles can happen in the universe as the result of general immaterial laws, why cannot they happen in the affairs of special individuals ? Again, individuals come and go like the lamp-light lighted and extinguished. While they exist, however they too embody in them the eternal laws of nature. The telescope reveals the glories of expanded nature. The microscope reveals the glories of contracted nature. A point in space has glories equal to the infinite heavens above our head. The laws of the animalculæ and of molecules are little known as compared with

*Galations IV.

the laws that regulate the revolutions of the great planets. They are yet beyond our ken. The laws, which we find regulating the large bodies of life and species, are daily becoming more apparent. But the great spiritual laws that regulate the little ones, the evanescent individuals, are still unknown to positive science. But in the pursuit of the great general laws, the laws of the individual may be discovered.

However that may be, life and nature and evolution and knowledge and ethics have no meaning, if the individual is uncared for and is only a temporary flicker, which goes out in a moment never to return. It is difficult to believe that these toiling, suffering, living beings are nothing and meant only to further the laws of matter and motion, for making the satellites revolve round the suns or for the production of lightning from electricity in the gloom of a cloudy stormy night, and that the great void is the King of All.

There are bodies of magnitude beyond our imagination and there are also bodies so minute as are nearly incomprehensible to us. The minute particles may again contain in them energy and force sufficient to move the sun. To the great God, little and great things or beings are of equal moment. To him the little tiny individual organism requires as much special care and I believe more care, than the infinite material world regulated by the laws of dead matter. The character of the relationship of the spiritual self of a living organism with the pure spiritual Essence, who dominates dead matter and all life, is not

capable of definition in material ideas. But we are conscious of such relationship ; the lowest of the children of the infinite God is conscious of it. Our inmost being feels and responds to the touch of the Most High.

To the material in man there can be no consciousness of God's love.

There is only one fact which should be here mentioned. There is no sense of pain in dead unconscious matter, and to matter the experience of the great love is impossible. As life and consciousness grow, pain becomes more and more felt and with the experience of pain, comes the experience of the love of the Comforter and the Healer. The greater the consciousness, the greater the pain and greater is the experience of His love. So far as we are unconscious matter, we have no such experience. So far as we are conscious and spiritual, we have such experience. As we grow in power and intellect, ethics and mercy, consciousness and spirit, we have greater and greater conscious appreciation of the love that supports us. In our present all but material stage, we are all but unconscious of it. But even we are not quite unconscious. In any case there is no reason for supposing that living beings have no actual experience of the love of the Comforter and the Helper in their weary, toilsome and sorrowful way ; on the contrary there is every reason to believe that they have such experience, which by the merciful law which ensures progress, is felt only in their inner subliminal consciousness. The relationship between self and God is not capable of being described in ideas and words which we possess at present.

We can, in the most exalted condition of our mind, have only that vague indefinite idea of wonder like that which the eye has of the infinite glorious heavens above us.

All the facts that I have known and experienced in life and all that commends to my imperfect reason on this the supreme question which is uppermost in the consciousness of all life; I have stated in this chapter. Greater, better and more spiritual men will soon give us higher and truer ideas of it in time. It is difficult to bear our burdens and sorrows. We are weary and heavy-laden and feel the burden of life oppressively great. Nevertheless, by some imperative law of our being, we are content to be patient and hopeful and we trust in the everlasting Lord of love, who does not sleep and who watches us while we sleep and while we labour and rejoice, suffer and die.

CHAPTER X.

PRAYER AND WORSHIP.

Prayer has been condemned by many philosophers ancient and modern and has gone out of fashion among persons who consider themselves above superstitions. Unfortunately the philosophers and scientists have good reason for their attitude. Prayers in all countries in all religions, from the most ancient times up to the present day, have been for health and beauty, money and fame, women and extermination of enemies, so frankly stated in the most popular of Sanscrit prayers. Again the priests early composed set forms of prayers and invested them with special mystical powers for compelling God to grant them. Set forms of prayers, formulas and charms are the very basis of all religions. It is true that "prayer is religion in act ; that is, prayer is true religion." But the meaning in which it is understood is that repeating set forms of prayers, formulas and charms and conforming to the rituals and ceremonies of a religious sect is true religion. No wonder the true philosopher and the scientist condemn such prayer.

It is widely believed that repetition of set forms of prayers, peculiar words and charms cure diseases, scare away ghosts and the devil himself. It is true they give the devotee mystic power and produce religious ecstasies and trances and the feeling of union with a pantheistic god. We have in a previous chapter discussed the causes of this and we need not dilate upon

them here again. The religious believers in prayers cite the instances of George Muller and others, and inscriptions in innumerable churches and halls declare that they have been built with money which flowed in consequence of prayers. Millions of men, who find daily that their prayers are not heard, look at these with wonder and feel a great reverence for the holy men whose prayers are heard and despair at their own worthlessness as being uncared for sons of God. The Atharvan and Tantrik priests have from time immemorial claimed to have cured diseases, to have killed the enemies of the devotees and to have attracted unwilling maidens by prayers. The efficacy of such prayers by famous devotees is believed by millions of men. This belief has led to curious results also. Mumbling old women have been supposed to possess maleficent powers and they have been killed, drowned in rivers or burnt, by thousands up to very recent times.

The very essence of these beliefs in the fulfilment of prayers, whether of George Muller or of the saints or of Tantrik priests, is that without the usual trouble and the labour necessary for a result, it could be achieved, especially if it be at the expense of another, by merely attaining to a certain attitude of the mind or by repeating some words, in a miraculous manner. That makes it striking and of value. That makes God manifest to the believers. That shows how the devotee is peculiarly and especially loved by God. The falsity and mischievousness of the idea are apparent. Many mystical believers in the efficacy of prayers

have felt the absurdity of prayers being thus heard by God and tried to explain the result by so called spiritual facts. W. H. Myers wrote on this subject thus:—

“ I am glad that you have asked me about prayer, because I have rather strong ideas on the subject. First, consider what are the facts. There exist around us a spiritual universe and that universe is in actual relation with the material. From the spiritual universe comes the energy which maintains the material, the energy which makes the life of each individual spirit. Our spirits are supported by a perpetual indrawal of this energy and the vigour of that indrawal is perpetually changing much as the vigour of our absorptions of material changes from hour to hour. I call these ‘ facts ’ because I think that some scheme of this kind is the only one consistent with our actual evidence too complex to summarize here. Plainly we must endeavour to draw in as much spiritual life as possible and we must place our minds in an attitude of open and earnest expectancy. Prayer is the general name for the attitude of open and earnest expectancy. If we then ask to whom to pray, the answer (strangely enough) must be that that does not much matter. The prayer is not indeed a purely subjective thing, it means a real increase in intensity of absorption of spiritual power or grace, but we do not know enough of what takes place in the spiritual world to know how the prayer operates, who is cognizant of it, or through what channel the grace is given. Better let children pray to Christ who is at any rate the highest individual spirit of whom we have any

knowledge. But it would be rash to say that Christ himself hears us," * It is a great relief to spiritualists and unbelievers in the personal God to be told that God himself does not hear the prayers directly. There may be a substratum of truth in Myer's explanation of the phenomena but for our purposes we have nothing to do with them. When mystic believers in the efficacy of prayers say "better let children pray to Christ" who does not hear them directly, it is no wonder that philosophers and scientists condemn all kinds of prayers and religious exercises mentioned above as fit for children only.

It is clear that the ideas described above, impressed upon the minds of men from time immemorial by medicine-men and learned priests, must be given up. Nor should the real issue be confused by philosophical explanations of prayers being fulfilled by spiritual 'indrawals', agencies and forces in and around us. The question is the oldest of questions put by the truthful philosopher to his doubting mind: "what is man or the Son of man that the Lord God should incline his ear to hear him?" If the Lord God does not hear his poor children, there is no religion for them. Notwithstanding all the philosophers, scientists and mystics, prayer constitutes the very essence of religion. Prayers are surely heard by the Lord of life himself, so far as is necessary for the fulfilment of the supreme purpose of life, namely to be and to be better. Let us consider the matter without prejudice and partiality.

* James's Varieties of Religious Experience p. 466.

Prayer proceeds from a natural instinct that there is a helper.

Prayer *i. e.* asking the Father to help us and to protect us, is the natural outcome of the instinct, we all living beings possess, which makes us believe that there is some one able and willing to help us and to turn to Him and call upon Him in our hour of need. It may be said that this inclination of the mind is the result of many generations of men having received help from their parents, brothers, friends and charitable neighbours and of the expectation thus generated in the mind ; even the crying of the child just when it is born may be traced to this circumstance. That is to some extent true. But over and above this expectation, produced by past experience and habit, there is the expectation of help even against nature, in an earthquake, in a storm at sea, in incurable disease and when at the point of death. The expectation of some thing after death may also be explained by the impression on the mind from continual hearing from our fellow-men of the existence of a future life or on the supposition of transmuting of souls in which Pythagorians, Hindus and Buddhists believed. It is said by materialistic biologists that the phenomena are the results of instinct or habit impressed on the mother's and the child's bodies for generations. The flowing of the milk to the breast may be a habit but not an instinct. The child was supported in the womb by food other than the milk of the breast. The flowing of the milk in the teats immediately after birth is a process different from that. It is a result in which the creative power possessed in certain functions for preser-

vation and growth by living beings was a contributory, if not the main, cause. The child's seeking for the teats and sucking the milk cannot be the result of past impressions, if there was no transmigration. The fact that the parents did it fifty years ago or the grandparents did it a hundred years ago may satisfy the mind of the materialist as a cause of the marvellous phenomena but will not satisfy an impartial unprejudiced mind. Superstition is implicit belief in ghosts, gods or nature or habit or instinct producing phenomena apparently mysterious. Immediately on the birth of the young one, the mother, human or beast, goes to its help and the milk flows into the teats; the young one clings to the mother, and seeks out the teats and draws milk by instinct. This instinct of the mother and the instinct of the young one may or may not be produced by past experience and habit. The anxious desire of the mother to succour her just-born child and the corresponding expectation of help and crying for it of the child, which had no experience of it before nor was taught by any body to do so, are however, it is clear, two correlated effects of one cause. It is like the rule of co-existent facts laid down by Buddha. The desire to succour exists always with the expectation of help. They are co-existent facts of nature. The desire of the merciful neighbour to help his distressed brother and the latter's expectation of help are co-existent. The moral law, which is spiritual and immaterial, by which the mother is prepared to sacrifice her own life for her child or by which a merciful man will risk or

even sacrifice his own life to save a drowning brother or willingly get himself killed in battle for the good of the many, is always found co-existent with the expectation of succour in the mind of living beings. The basis of this fact of nature is non-material. We cannot say that the expectation of succour in the mind of the distressed person and also his distress are produced by the ethical law for its own fulfilment. Nor is it possible to agree with the philosophers, who would base the moral law on selfishness or with the pantheistic Hindu that this desire to help is the result solely of the arrogation of the mind of the distress of others to itself, because the succourer and the distressed being according to it the same person, the distressed would feel that he is also the person able to relieve the distress and would not feel its existence at all. The pangs of hunger are felt only by the famished person when he cannot procure food and not when he has plenty of it at his disposal. The instinct in the mother and the instinct in the young one are, as we have seen above, co-existent in nature and are thus connected by a common law. The expectation of succour by the distressed and the ethical desire to help are both co-existents correlated phases of one effect proceeding from some law yet to be discovered, which with others, supports the fact of nature called Life.

There is another surprising fact in nature. The desire to help accompanies the helpless condition of the distressed. The mother animal loves and takes care of her offspring and protects it, even at the sac-

rice of her own life, only so long as it is helpless. Her love and desire to protect and help vanish as soon as the offspring can take care of themselves. It is the same with the male parent, who in many species become very jealous of its male offspring when they grow up and try to destroy them. This crying for succour of the helpless young one to the mother and the mother's anxiety to protect and feed it are certainly impulses, which are constituents of what is called life. The impulse to help the child so long as it is helpless is obviously not an instinct or a habit, which can make no distinction between the helpless and the strong and of which the ethical and merciful character of the impulse can be no constituent. It is the law by which dead irrational merciless nature secures the continuance of living organisms in the universe. How can it be explained? This law is the very origin of ethics and altruism, which are inconsistent with dead material laws and with the primary law of self-preservation. Now, this law shows that some thing in Nature always provides for the succour of living beings, when they are helpless. The cry of the helpless and the distressed is heard and answered in a mysterious manner. We find however this phenomenon so long as it is necessary for the continuance of life. But with the development of the powers of life, we find this impulse to help manifesting itself in the desire to succour the hopelessly afflicted, diseased and the dying, and to protect them as long as is possible from the ruthless laws of nature, which eliminate such living organisms. The helpless living

being cries for help from the time of its birth to the time of its death. Its cry is answered in nature, we find, when the organism is utterly helpless at birth. We find however, in advanced living beings a desire to answer such cry of distress in all stages of life and we find this desire growing with the growth and development of the powers of life.

The desire to succour the helpless, not for the purpose only of the preservation of life for providing a play-thing for laughing cruel Nature, but for the purpose of helping for the sake of helping only, for the sake of mercy, is growing in the universe of Life, like all the other higher qualities, like Reason, Justice, Mercy and Love. So long as it accorded with the law of preservation of the species there could be some plausible but no real explanation of it as being a law of nature, but when it is antagonistic to all the laws of nature in its subsequent development, some extra-natural cause must be sought to explain it. The cry of distress in the world of mortal men is being increasingly heard and answered up to the very limit of the powers and resources of man. With the increasing powers of man that limit is extending, but there remains still a limit. That does not satisfy us poor weak helpless mortals. Is the cry answered by a person whose powers, whose mercy and whose love are without limit? When man in his agony extends his hand in death for help, if it is by a law of his being, help must be awaiting him. We know that for the preservation of life, the new-born organism cries for help and by a law of nature, with-

out the mother's wishing it, the means of meeting its needs come into existence and the overpowering love of the mother also comes into existence, only for the period of its helplessness. If such cry is heard and answered for the preservation of life by the law which preserves the universe of life such cry also must be heard and answered when it is required for the other and higher law of life which leads to the progress and development of the powers of life—of reason, mercy and love,—and to the growth of the spirit. If life is progressive that cry, whenever it is necessary for the progress of life, must be heard and answered by the laws of life. The mother is content with preserving the life when the offspring is helpless. Brother-man, society and the state will help one to come up to the existing high water mark of progress. But higher and higher progress is secured by a law of life, which neither the law of conservation of life nor all the laws of fraternal sympathy or of society or of the state will explain. It has been shown before that the evolution of the higher life without the continuance of individual life is a meaningless farce. Admitting the fact of continued existence and that of continued progress of the individual, its wants necessary for such existence and progress are provided for by the laws of life. *The cry of distress of the individual is always heard, when it accords with the law of progress. So far and so much of the sorrow, as is necessary to be suffered for the evolution of the higher life, must be suffered. Such suffering for working out the higher life must be regarded as merci-

ful. The suffering and pain that should be relieved for the purposes of such evolution *are* relieved by the laws of life. A Person always hears the cry of distress and answers it. Our inmost being is conscious of the fact. We do not know the ways of Providence or the laws of life, which are beyond our powers of understanding. But if there be such Providence, the cry is heard and answered. The pain and the cry of pain are natural. The answer is also found in accordance with the merciful law of life mentioned above.

The expectation of succour and the cry of the distress for help proceed from some primary law of Life. This expectation is not a mere dream but is based on the reality of help which meets it. Thus it is a law of Nature "ask and it shall be given unto you", "knock and it shall be opened unto you." Jesus is the primordial living being, who believes in the reality of the law and is certain of it. Therefore crying in distress and calling for help to air or to the unseen Helper are not the effect of mere hallucination or ignorance. Notwithstanding all the philosophers and self-sufficient religious men, prayer is natural and necessary to man, as crying is to the just-born babe. As the cry of the babe for milk is answered by the mother, so the prayer of the grown-up man for the help needed for his progress and his good is also answered. What is harmful for our growth we do not know. We ask for many things and when we do not get them, we lose our faith in prayer. We forget that "if a son shall ask bread of the father"

he gives the real bread of life and not merely a stone. God or kind nature answers the prayer for all that is necessary for the improvement of the species and also of the individual. The individual apparently is less cared for than the species. But I have shown that the individual is in reality more important than the aggregate, and if there be any God, the individual only has any meaning for Him and can alone be an object of love and not dead nature or any species.

It has been attempted to show in these pages that the evolution of higher and nobler life brings into existence truer and truer ideas of God. Thus the highly cultured and ethically noble person is better qualified for prayer than his less advanced brother. That is true to some extent. The less advanced man prays to stocks and ghosts. To him the person from whom he expects help or spiritual thrills is the God. Thus goodness is not associated with the idea of God among less advanced races. Even among highly civilized Christian European religious men, as a well-known English writer on Ethics says, love and worship of God are not associated with any idea of goodness. Religious men would worship a god, that is evil but who is gracious to them and who hears their prayers by granting power and wealth, fame and women and by destroying their enemies. Even the monk in his cloister meditates on a God, who gives him pleasurable spiritual experience or anticipations of happiness to come and does not think of Him as essentially the good God, Who should be worshipped because He is good first. Now this ideal of worship is too high for the ordinary man. Is the

prayer of ordinary men, like us, whose minds are engrossed by the pleasures, the fears and hopes of this material existence, false and thus unnecessary? Surely not. The stocks and stones and the ghosts as well as the images of the crucified Christ or of the Sacred Heart or of Avalokitesvara Buddha who forbade all prayers or of the Hindu gods, hear the prayers of men in real trouble or danger and these prayers, so far as they are necessary for the well-being of those men, are always granted, in a manner not contemplated by themselves, by the merciful Lord, by whom goodness and spiritual life are being evolved. We poor men stretch forth our hands in agony for help into the void or hold an idol or a picture convulsively to our bosom or depend upon the repetition of holy formulas. The new-born child does not know that its mother is near and cries and holds forth its hands for the teats that will give it sustenance. Scientists call it instinct and are satisfied but such satisfaction is unscientific. Behind the instinct surely there is a latent consciousness in the little one that the mother and the teats are there near at hand. Likewise, behind the ignorant man weeping and praying to stocks, stones, ghosts and idols, or convulsively holding fast a symbol to his bosom, there is the latent consciousness of the helping Mother near at hand. So we poor men must call upon the Mother in our need and grief, not knowing Her true nature or our real needs. She gives us material sustenance as a means for the development of the spiritual nature in us. She grants our prayers or gives us pains and

sorrows for that supreme purpose of our life. Pains and sorrows are very often the milk that sustains and develops spiritual life. The spiritual life is our true life; whatever is necessary for that we in our inmost consciousness ask and we get it. But the material pleasures and pains are at present more important to us than the spirit. Is the God, Who gave this material frame, unconscious of this fact? I cannot believe it. His ways are beyond our little intellect. We poor little men shall go on calling upon Him in our little griefs and pains and aspirations after little things, hoping that He hears our prayers and comes near us and gives us what is good for us. But whether He hears and grants our prayers or not, we poor men and women shall always bow down our heads and rest them on the void, believing that we are resting on the bosom of the merciful Lord of all Life. We can not do otherwise.

Intimately connected with prayer is worship. Prayer is a natural instinct. Worship is acquired by noble effort. It is the free-will offering of the soul. When man reaches a certain stage of ethical growth, he finds that his individual existence is of little moment, in comparison with the growth of the universe of sense and mind and spirit. Who is there so base who will not agree to suffer death and the pains of hell of the theologians so that by his sufferings eyes may be evolved in the blind groping world of life? Who is there, who is of any worth, who will not sacrifice himself for the greater beauty, the greater mind and the greater goodness of the universe of life? It is

a law of nature and it has been impressed on the world of life that the individual must suffer pains for the greater good of all, for the *better*. The nobility of the act and of the process are not apparent to the mind, till the living being attains to a certain stage of ethical progress.

The attitude of the mind to work, to suffer and even to die for the evolution of nobler and happier life in this universe, not because one has to do so by irresistible laws of nature, but willingly as a co-worker with nature or more correctly with the moral and loving, intelligent Governor of nature, is worship. This individual life, it is not possible to conceive, was produced by the individual itself. The Giver and the Lord of life is certainly entitled to command the willing and loving service of His children, who attain to a certain stage of growth. They can not but consider that the evolution of the kingdom of heaven is of more moment than their own life, and find that to work for it is the noblest work of life and is the only true happiness. Worship leads to a sense of the nobility of life and to the love towards the Giver of life. All noble conduct is worship. But prayer also is noble and often better than worship, as it is humbler. The attitude of prayer at its best leads to the love of God and so does worship. When these two have that effect, they are identical in reality and are absolutely noble.

Every religious man knows how difficult it is to worship God. Men pray to God when in difficulty and danger. That prayer may be addressed to any

body,—God or devil. Very few people would refuse to pay to the Devil if there be any chance of relief from him. The positive religion would not consider as prayer. When one refuses to take relief from any one except the good Father and relies on Him that is true prayer. That prayer is always heard, if it is for the good of the man who seeks God's help. True prayer is thus not very easy to make. Worship is still more difficult. Our minds are all but engrossed with matters of sense and selfish desires. Religious men find extreme difficulty in sitting down even for five minutes and engaging the mind in the contemplation of the Deity. Thus many artificial methods have been invented. Names and formulas are repeated, and beads counted, prayer-wheels turned the processes of the Yoga adopted. Even then it is a fact that a deeply religious man, when counting his beads, more often than not, thinks about his worldly and selfish interests. The truest worship is therefore service of God according to one's lights, at the sacrifice of selfish interests. This leads us to the love of God. But sitting near God which is meant by Upasana, the Sanscrit word for worship, is indispensable. Even repetitions of formulas and Yoga have their uses in quieting the mind. The quieting of the heart is attained only by the true philosopher and religious man. It is attained by deep thought by the philosopher. But the truly religious man alone can feel in deep quiet the touch of the loving Father whose purity is beyond conception. Quietism has its value. In positive religion, reason and philosophy are also of supreme importance, for without them, the true God is

not attained. Thus positive religion relies upon reason as well as worship. The power to worship, the inclination to love God and to make pleasure in His company, are attained slowly and painfully only by the methods of positive real religion and not by fanciful cults. The truly religious man again quiets his desire for things of sense and other selfish ends and looks to God for guidance. In sorrow and difficulty and danger, he throws himself on the bosom of the Father and his throbbing heart is stilled. This is true quietism. The great quiet leads us to our inmost consciousness, the very base of life, where the Lord reigns. Thus psychic power sometimes follows the truly religious man who contemns all practices and cults other than the worship of the good Father of all. The power to worship and to love are however, slowly attained with much labour, much sacrifice and much thought. In the Proverbs, wisdom says "I love them that love me and those that seek me early shall find me." What is stated there is very much more true of God. God loves all life. They also, who by high culture are able to love Him, feel that He loves them. Aye, God for inscrutable reasons wants the love of his creatures. To be able to love Him is the greatest of all good fortune. Therefore should every father teach his children early to acquire the habit of prayer and to seek God and to cling to Him and never to forsake Him, God never forsakes his children, but they seldom, if ever, seek His company. The noblest culture, the highest attainment of man, is to get the frame of mind, in which one will never forsake the Lord of life, whatever may befall him here or hereafter.

CHAPTER XI.

MYSTICISM.

Mysticism has been considered as the very essence of religion. Religious teachers of all countries and of all descriptions have claimed to have derived their authority from mystic sources. They despise all reason and logic and straightway tell us that there can be no reason about things religious. These are said to be matters of actual experience and that all reasons to the contrary are futile. From the Saman down to the most modern saint, direct communion has been claimed with the ghost, the angel and the god worshipped. Surprising as it may appear, the Vedantist and the pantheist have claimed that their philosophy is based upon actual experience. They tell us that by the process of Yoga, one can experience that he is identical with the Supreme Being himself. Mysticism can not therefore be ignored in any consideration about religion and worship.

The ancient Hindu philosophers enunciated the doctrine of Koshas or layers of consciousness. The doctrine has assumed the form of fields or layers of consciousness in modern philosophy. The materialistic biologist says that many of the actions of a living being, which are involuntary and instinctive, are only results of the persisting impressions of the actions of the lower forms of life from which the present form has been evolved. The fact is considered conclusive of the law of evolution. The pure materialist finds it difficult to conceive the influx of

an immaterial soul in the sperm which grows to be the man. But it is equally difficult to conceive the transmission of hereditary tendencies and tendencies to involuntary action transmitted from the lowest forms of life. The fact is that there are innumerable layers in the consciousness of man. The layer of consciousness of the beast is there and also the layers of consciousness of succeeding species. Is it possible to conceive of a consciousness wholly material in its constitution which can store up innumerable fields or layers of consciousness and is it possible to conceive that such consciousness is a property of the sperm? The materialist will answer, it is equally inconceivable that the consciousness of the beast has gone through the process of transmigration, which is a theory not accepted by the majority of philosophers and religious men. But if transmigration will solve the difficulty, its unpopularity will be no argument against its truth. But there may be more unexceptionable solutions of the difficulty. The fields or layers of consciousness are a real fact of life, proved beyond doubt by doctors and experimental psychologists. The subliminal consciousness surely exists. But there is one fact about it which makes the question more complex.

Subliminal
consciousness
of two kinds.

The subliminal consciousness is two-fold. The first is the transmitted consciousness of the lower animal and of the past feelings of the present existence. Its ante-natal character proves transmigration and continuity of individual existence before and therefore after death, unless the instinct of ages could be a property of the sperm. The second

is a consciousness in which the higher life is reflected.

The scientist, the philosophers, the saint, the Buddha, all become oblivious of their surroundings and reach the truth in their subliminal consciousness. Illuminations and exaltations occur in the subliminal consciousness.

The higher
consciousness.

The purely material constitution of consciousness is incompatible with the consciousness of the higher life. Nor is it possible that the subliminal consciousness inherited from the lowest forms of life can be the field upon which the consciousness of life higher than that of ordinary man can be reflected. Transmigration may or may not be true but the above facts show that in our consciousness something higher than pure matter is cognized. The innumerable impressions on the mind, which are never completely lost, may show that it is like a material slate or it may show that it has an immaterial basis. It is true that the innumerable impressions, if they are on a material surface, are never wholly lost. Thus when the consciousness merely recognizes and is affected by a past impression, it may or may not be wholly material. The instinct acquired by continual repetition of the stronger impressions may persist and actions which are the results of no such strong impressions may fade away and may not be recognized even if those impressions may be transmitted in the consciousness of men and other animals. But the other and higher consciousness which recognizes truths and aspects of goodness and beauty never apprehended before and which apprehend ideas not appreciated before by a person or his ancestors can

not be attributed to a material origin. The senses may certainly have perception of new real objects and the mind may generalize by bringing together the new facts and arrive at certain ideas, admitting the position of the materialist to be correct. But if there be an apprehension of entities, ideas and the likes which no combination of things of possible material origin can enable us to cognize through the existing, sense-organs, we must assume them to be of non-material origin. The idea of the better, the more beautiful, the nobler can not be produced by any objects of material origin in the field of the present normal consciousness which cognizes the things and ideas conveyed at present by the existing senses. It can not be the effect of transmission from ancestors who never had that idea. It is apprehended not in the field of consciousness upon which the sense-perceptions ordinarily act in our waking and rational moments. The better, the more beautiful and the nobler are instinctively apprehended. That instinct has not been transmitted. It exists therefore not in the first kind of subliminal consciousness which is the result of past and transmitted impression. It exists in the second kind of subliminal consciousness on which is reflected "the light that never was on land or sea before." On this plane of consciousness great and undreamt-of-before truths flash. On this plane of consciousness also it is possible that angels and gods whose lives are constituted of the better, the more beautiful, the nobler and the truer may be touched. God from whom the better and the higher proceeds touches us here. It is on

this plane that the relationship with Him is felt. Most psychologists are of opinion that this plane of consciousness consists of feelings. The lower part of it surely consists of feelings. That part of our consciousness, in which is stored up all the past impressions, when it recalls those impressions, enables us to do so because of the deep feelings evoked by them which caused them to be so strongly impressed as to be capable of reproduction. It therefore seems to consist of feelings, because there is no act of the will or reason in it, the re-production being involuntary. But the higher latent consciousness is of a different kind. The reason higher than what is possessed by us is evolved there. When Buddha attained enlightenment, when he meditated walking for hours dead to touch and sight and to the sound of a hundred carts and the continuous roar of thunderstorms, he was in that plane. Many mathematicians, scientists and philosophers in deep thought attain to that consciousness in which their senses seem dead. That is the plane in which alone clearer vision, the second sight or the third eye of Siva is manifested and higher truth, higher morality and higher æsthetics are evolved. But it is not every body who in that state attains to them. Truth which is higher than what the capacity of the ordinary man can grasp, when reflected on the mind of a beast or of an ordinary man whose culture has not enabled him actively to cognize it, carries no meaning to it or him. A savage primitive man even, if the principles of calculus were reflected on his mind, will find no meaning in them and no impression will in consequence beu

produced on his consciousness. It is only the few highly gifted rare individuals who when in the state of absorbing deep thought attain to the higher truth and the higher life. Like Buddha, they attain to them when they had been made properly receptive by past culture and are superlatively active and not quiescent like the mere uncultured mystics.

Effects on
quiescent
mind.

Again by certain processes and habit, the quiescent frame of mind may be attained and the subliminal consciousness reached. The subject may then become clairvoyant or see sights and hear sounds, the impressions of which may have been stored up before or the impressions of which it may get from other minds or objects around it. Telepathy and visions and appreciation of the wonders of the universe higher than that of the ordinary sense-organs in the natural waking state are concomitants of the mind in this stage. In this stage, the mind has the impressions of other peoples' minds and as the senses seem dead, the consciousness seems to absorb the entire universe.

As in a starless new moon night the whole universe seems to be absorbed in black night and the objects of the universe cannot be distinguished from one another, so in the quiescent condition, the senses, which by their nature are active when there is diversity, being dead and the sun of present active life of sense which was bringing into the field of consciousness multiform nature having gone down below the horizon, no distinctions appear. This the philosophers, the Vedantists, the pantheists, the trance-men and the

mystics suppose to be the consciousness identical with that of Brahman or the absolute God.* This state is attained by gazing on the tip of the nose or a crystal or an idol or the sun or the crucifix. Unity of perception is the object aimed at and is attained. This state may also be attained not only by gazing upon a particular symbol but also by continuous harping on an object. The unity of perception under these conditions does not prove real unity of all things.

Mysticism is of two kinds the ignoble and the noble. Both have been treated philosophically by Hindus and Buddhists and also practised widely. Hindus and Buddhists are the originators and teachers of it and to their teachings all mystics have turned in all ages.

The noble mysticism came into existence first as a result of the meditations of the philosophers, Buddhist and Hindu, and was practised by them. But certain nervous conditions brought about in both in the primary stages led to hysterical spiritualism and immoral Tantrikism, of which the cult of Yoginis is well known and which led to fancied sexual enjoyment with supernaturally beautiful female spirits. Spiritualism in India speaks of many such instances. Let there be no subterfuge and no mistake about it. That has been the end of mystic Tantrikism and also of spiritualism. The beautiful goddess becomes, when the person becomes Siddha or the *adept*, his wife and gives him all desired objects and

* William James in his interesting book on The Varieties of Religious experiences has recorded numerous mystic experiences. They all come under this category. His inference and that of the philosophers and mystics that these prove unity of life is wholly unscientific and illusory.

in the end takes him up to heaven * The imperative condition however was that the mystic should never go to his own human wife. There are people who are rather impatient and enjoy human females in their religious practices as pleasing to the goddess who is not easily attainable. Among spiritualists also hysteric young men are sometimes possessed by female spirits and young women by male spirits who are very hard to shake off. Doctors tell us these hallucinations originate in certain reprehensible practices. These unpleasant facts must be mentioned in connection with mysticism which ordinarily end in things like the above. They must be mentioned in order to disabuse the minds of noble men and women who take to it. The belief in ghosts and other spirits, Hindu Gandharvas and the like and the Arabic Gins and the like, inherited by man from his primitive ancestors, has led astray the mind of the religious man and produced very extraordinary phenomena.

But there surely is a noble mysticism. It was first promulgated by Buddha and systematized by Buddhist philosophers. The Hindu Yoga philosophy is however the most complete and scientific exposition of it. According to it, Yoga consists of eight Angas or component parts. † The first is Yama, which means Ahinsa or cessation from injuring life, truth, complete sexual abstinence and non-acceptance of things of the world. The second is Niyama or cleanliness of the body and of the mind consisting in want of envy and malice, contentment, *tapasya* or

* See Bhuta Damara, a famous Tantra.

† See Yoga Sutra II 2, 35, 49. III 1, 3.

asceticism and in indifference to hunger and thirst, heat and cold, pleasure and pain &c, philosophic study and last of all in dedicating all actions to God. The third is Ashana or different modes of sitting easy and firm for contemplation described in the book*. The fourth is Pranayama or the regulation or restraint of breath for which elaborate rules are laid down. The firm seat and regulation of breath lead to a condition akin to what is called by Europeans scientific self-hypnotism. The fifth is the practice called Pratyahara which means obliging the sense organs to lose all interest in and be utterly inattentive to objects of sense. When the above five are attained the Yogee attempts the sixth which is known as Dharana, or concentration of the mind on one object of worship or any other object in its various aspects. The last is Samadhi, a condition in which even contemplation is lost and one is lost in self or nothingness.† This last is what is called the proof positive based on actual experiment and experience on which the doctrines of pantheism and also of Nirvana or the final nothingness or void of the Buddhist philosophers are supposed to be founded.

The Buddhists use the word Bhavanas instead of Dhyana. Bhavana consists in contemplating the impermanence and worthlessness of all things. Those Bhavanas include contemplation of dead bodies and

* These are physiological curiosities and are scientific. The physical practices of the body, the various postures, their clearing even their intensities &c. are certainly marvellous and no wonder they produce veneration in the minds of men. They are well-worth investigations by physiologists.

† It is well-known to every body that absorption of the mind in one subject makes one forget all objects of sense and sometimes the breath itself is stilled.

frequenting of burning grounds, which strangely enough led to cremation-ground immoral Tantrika practices. The Buddhist Dhyana or Samadhi consists of different stages. The first is concentration of the mind upon one point (as in the Hindu Yoga, upon the tip of the nose or on the point between the two eyebrows) or on one object. It leads to a state of partial self-hypnotization in which the intellect is not wholly inactive. The next higher stage is that in which the intellect becomes inactive and a sense of unity remains. The Arhat goes higher and higher and at last the conviction enters his mind that there exists absolutely nothing and there are neither idea nor absence of ideas and he proceeds to the way of Nirvana.

Thus the Hindu and European and the Sufi Yogee, all end with the feeling of identity of his self with God as he learnt from philosophical books, and the Buddhist Yogee goes higher and ends in the consciousness of nothingness, just as he learnt from Buddhist philosophic books. The stages are merely nervous conditions of the body which delude the devotee. It is true that Yogees are hard men having much control of their body and mind and not liable to the influence of others. But when they are self-hypnotized, they cannot avoid the nervous condition peculiar in that state. Many have testified to illumination in this condition. St. Ignatius Loyla said : " one day in orison on the steps of the choir of the Dominican church I saw in a distinct manner the plan of divine wisdom in the creation of the world. St. Theresa said : " One day in orison it was granted

me to perceive in one instant how all things are seen and contained in God". Both St. Ignatius Loyla and St. Theresa testify that they had illuminations enabling them to comprehend how three could be one and to understand the mystery of the holy Trinity*. Now, we have positive rules laid down in the famous Yoga Sutra of Patanjali where we find that by concentrating our mind on the tip of the nose we can, when we reach Samadhi, know all that exists in the sun and the planets round it. This is not quite so ambitious as seeing in a distinct manner the plan of the creation of the universe but is of the same character. The self-hynotized Yogee in reality has the consciousness mentioned above but it is clear that this knowledge of theirs and their illumination of truth is of much less value than that of visions of apparitions or of consciousness of the presence of ghosts and angels. For in their knowledge of the plan of the creation the great saints and Yogees mentioned above never rose above the error such as that the sun revolved round the earth or that the moon was a luminary and the stars were diamonds of twinkling light set in the blue dome above the fixed centre of the universe, the earth, or that the angels and gods were beings with human desires, having wings and other superhuman faculties, which were prevalent in their time.

The effects of Yoga and Trantika practices are little known to philosophers, to European theosophist leaders of Hindus and to Hindu Vedantists who

* Effects of
Yoga little
known.

* The Varieties of Religious Experience p.410, 411.

have taken upon themselves to instruct Europe and America and English-educated India. * Just consider what Madame Blavatsky says on a familiar manifestation, namely the Nada, among a class of Yogis : " He who would hear the voice of Nada, the soundless sound and comprehend it, he has to learn the nature of Dharana * * * when he has ceased to hear the many, he may discern the One. And now thy self is lost in self. Thou art thy Master and thy God. * * The seven sounds in one, the voice of silence. Om Tat Sat."* The awe-struck western and English-educated Indian accepts this grotesque statement as a wonderful revelation. But the Nada is a real physical effect produced by certain physical processes of self-hypnotization. As a matter of fact the Yogi in that state hears exquisite sounds apprehended not by the outer ear but internally. The vibrations which are apprehended proceed from the suppressed breath within and not from the outside air. They are subtle notes, the character of which has yet to be investigated. These sounds help in producing self-hypnotization. The worshippers of the Nada are a well-known sect in India who develop many subtle powers. The small still voice described by Sir Thomas Browne and the Hebrew prophets is composed of Nada. But when they fancy that ' soft and savoury sleep of nothingness ' attained by Nada or other culture in a hypnotic sub-consciousness is identity

* Indians who have gone through the Yoga and Tantrika culture feel amused at the ideas entertained by persons who pose as Yogees but who never had the courage and the patience to go through the laborious and dangerous physical processes of the Yoga cult.

with God, one cannot but feel amused. Similarly, European writers and Hindus who follow them write in rapturous terms of the Tantras. The sexual excitement and the intoxication of liquor, as William James rightly pointed out, have been resorted to from the most ancient times in all countries for producing a state of hypnotization leading to subliminal consciousness and elimination for the time being of the wide-awake consciousness. That is a physiological fact about neurosis.

But the most important fact about these phenomena is that apparitions are perceived, diseases are cured, super-sensuous perceptions become possible and material objects are, it is alleged, become liable to moved from a distance. The clairvoyant Tantrika sees visions, of the reality of which he has no doubt. Siva, the most dreadful creation of human imagination, is seen in all his dreaded features but still apprehended as a joyous, beneficent god. The dreadful hallucinations of the lunatic or of the hysterical patient or of one possessed can not produce this marvellous commingling of the dreadful and the beneficent. The question of questions is whether in our higher subliminal consciousness; visions of real higher entities are apprehended as saints, angels or gods, according to the prepossessions of the subject, in forms corresponding to forms which they are believed to have, or whether such visions are merely results of a diseased state of mind. The Tantrika and the Yogee prove by their clairvoyant and other powers that their consciousness take cogni-

zance of real entities and therefore they assert that the visions are real. Marvellous physical and material consequences flowing from the phenomena are testified to by utterly truthful men. William James says: "If there be higher powers able to impress us, they may get access to us only through the subliminal door". There may be truth in this statement.

There is again a state of abnormal consciousness in which the mind is not quiescent but is abnormally and unhealthily active. The nervous condition which brings about the abnormal consciousness in which unregulated activity is observed may take the subject to the subliminal condition, a step lower than which is insanity, in which instincts like those of the beast may possess the mind entirely, the step lower still being that of pure unreasoning active material force. This subliminal consciousness may be brought about by physical disturbances or by intoxicating drugs or gases. Hysteria, perception of apparitions and demoniacal possession are brought about by physical disturbances. In these conditions, the normal consciousness becomes latent and the subliminal consciousness comes to the surface. The patient sometimes develops clairvoyant and telepathic powers and it is a wonderful fact vouched for by thousands in India, that it also temporarily develops a power of moving material objects, such as flowers, leaves and drugs for healing purposes, which are popularly believed to be moved and brought by supernatural beings. In the clairvoyant condition the patient says and

does thing which astonish people around him. When a patient develops the above powers, he is supposed to be possessed by a god, demon or ghost. The god, demon or ghost may or may not exist in reality. It certainly exists in the mind of the patient. It is very frequently the result of auto-suggestion. The Indian exorcist of ghosts, when the patient does not disclose the person possessing him or her, puts the suggestion of a dead person as possessing him or her into the mind of the patient and then cures by means of suggestions effectual to remove that ghost. The process is very simple and often childish but effectual all the same. Thus these possessions are not of much real importance. But saints and philosophers have made much of them. The apparitions and visions are mostly, if not all, cases of auto-suggestion. Demons and angels and gods are actually seen by a person in a certain nervous condition as a result of auto-suggestion. This explains the facts and it is not necessary to assume supernatural agencies, though one may believe in the possibility of their existence. Auto-suggestion is in those cases clear. A Christian saint has the vision of St. Mary or of the angel Gabriel or of some other saint. A Hindu saint has the vision of Kali or Siva or Hari. A Negro medicine-man has visions of his fetishes. All these are often merely creations of the imagination having no real existence. The vision is in accordance with the belief of the person and is thus clearly the result of auto suggestion.*

*These visions may however sometimes be of real objects seen in forms according to the propessions of the seer.

The phenomenon of possession has a remarkable characteristic. The patient by an act of auto-suggestion appears to lose his own identity in the identity of the ghost, fetish, demon angel or god and acts as he had been told or as he believed that the supposed spirit would have acted. The clairvoyant power developed enables him to know very often the secrets of the life of the deceased person who he supposes possesses him.

The philosophic saint by auto-suggestion imagines himself to be identical with God Himself and this is supposed by many to be proof positive of the essential identity of God and man. One instance will show the nature of these manifestations. Chaitanya was the greatest miracle-working saint of India. He is said to have revived the dead and his touch would make thousands intoxicated with the love of God preached by him. He is worshipped by millions even now as the greatest incarnation of God which has appeared among men. From his early boyhood, he was subject to epileptic fits which were considered fits of insanity by his parents and by his neighbours. He was however, one of the most learned and intelligent scholars among Indians of his time and no pundit was his equal in disputation. But the love of God intoxicated him. He imagined himself to be God. He imagined that he was the boar-incarnation and acted like a boar. He fancied he was Radha and acted distractedly like love-sick Radha seeking her lover Krishna. In his fits he became in turns all the incarnations of God, of which he had read in the Puranas, and acted during the

the said time of the possession exactly as those books describe those incarnations to have acted. It is a strange physiological fact, described by eye-witnesses in books the authenticity of which is difficult to question, that his body for the time being developed properties supposed to exist in the animals or persons supposed to possess him. Some of his disciples were also possessed in a similar fashion but not by God himself, as they were all opponents of Vedantists and considered themselves only servants of God. One old man fancied himself to be the monkey-god and jumped and nimbly climbed trees and it is said a tail was developed in his body for the time being. Thus is proved that even in the case of the greatest saint the world has produced, the identity with God, the consciousness of which was very real to him, was purely an effect of auto-suggestion, unless one believes that the boar and the tortoise incarnations and monkey-gods produced by the fruitful imagination of great poets were real beings. The feeling of identity with the ghost of the deceased person manifesting himself in a spiritual seance is a common occurrence and is clearly the effect of suggestion, either of the person possessed or of the controller of the seance. This feeling of identity surely is no proof of the identity of man and God as fancied by Vedantists, and western philosophers nor is it proof of ghost-possession of the spiritualist.

The awful cult of spiritualism must be mentioned here. The spirits of Moses, Zoroaster, Christ, Buddha, Washington and all the great and good men

of past ages are supposed to be compelled to come to seances. If it is the fate of great men or even of little men to remain stationary and in the expressive words of Hindu Saastras, "become only air and without any refuge" after death for thousands of years, and to be the playthings of common men, it is infinitely better that personality did not survive the body. This is sufficient reason for any ordinary thinking man to reject this awful cult altogether.

No sooner a person is dead, the belief is common in India and also in other countries that his ghost wants to harm members of his own household and elaborate precautionary rites are performed that he may not enter the house again. The exorcist is brought in if his apparition is seen by any. Thus belief in spirits destroys even the affections of the dearest relations of the dead, whose 'hairs would stand on end' in the expressive words of the Bible, if the "spirit was before" them.

There is an element of terror accompanying belief in spirits, which has oppressed man for thousands of years. This great terror is graphically described in the hieroglyphics of Egypt and in the old Testament. Gins and demons have been terrifying man from time immemorial and are equally recognized by the spiritualist with spirits of the dead. Professor Burgess rightly says:—"The firm belief in witchcraft, magic and demons was inherited by the Middle Ages from antiquity but it became more lurid and made the world more terrible. Men believed that they were

surrounded by fiends watching for every opportunity to harm them, that pestilences, storms, eclipses and famines were the work of the Devil; but they believed as firmly that ecclesiastical rites were capable of coping with these enemies."* The great power wielded by priests and religious men, even by Christ and his apostles and by Buddhist priests, was owing to their power of exorcising ghosts and devils.

Tiger-ghosts and serpent ghosts were as common among the ancient races as among the savages of the present day. The tiger and the serpent stalked man in silence and darkness. Cruel man also preferred to attack his fellow-man in darkness and to take him unawares. Darkness, stealthy steps whispering sounds accompany all ghosts now. The possessed person shudders at fancied stealthy steps and whispering voices and has the feeling that somebody is behind him, as I have seen in many cases. The impressions on the mind, for a million of years of the primitive man and the nervous condition induced thereby have been transmitted to men and women of the present day. Even the greatest unbeliever would start at an unusual sound and feel a weird creeping sensation at dark nights in solitary cemeteries or burning grounds. The ghost thus actually manifests itself to the mind of the scientist as well as of the common man, which is affected by the nervous constitution and the impressions and tendencies inherited by him. The belief even of some scientific men thus prove nothing. The nervous phenomena supposed to

* Freedom of Thought.

be the result of ghostly possession and queer and weird sensations are easily explained in the light of the facts of the life and surroundings of our ancestors.

Most spiritualistic phenomena may be explained by auto-suggestion and hypnotism and the mystical facts of subliminal consciousness described above. But there remain still some awful phenomena which are difficult of explanation. But I am sure they will be explained some day. In the meantime every right thinking man should stand up against fancied ghosts and spirits and rid the world of the greatest of all terrors.

Mystic phenomena when the mind is extra active.

Our normal consciousness is like the surface of the earth; underneath are layer after layer, water and fire and great pent up forces of matter, which are not seen but which mould the future of the surface. Underneath the normal consciousness are layer after layer of past impressions and great forces so subtle that they may reasonably be supposed to be practically non-material, if not wholly spiritual, which mould the surface consciousness. These forces have to be investigated. Now there are two remarkable facts about this subliminal consciousness. It is attained first when the mental equilibrium is lost and brain cerebration becomes extra-active, being freed from all regulation. Hysteria, demoniacal possession, visions of apparitions are manifestations of this condition. These belong to the domain of physicians.

But equally marvellous, indeed more marvellous, results flow from the contrary state of mind, i.e. when

the mind attains perfect quiet, Among the noble forms of mysticism is the cult of quietism. In the condition of perfect quiet of the mind most marvellous phenomena manifest themselves. Indeed the attainment of the state of quiet has been the aim and object of all mystic philosophers. Quietism was not founded by Molinos, though he demonstrated its greatness in Europe. In India there were the Santas or the ascetics, Buddhists and Vedantists and Lama saints who had quieted their passions and whose great object was to make their consciousness like a glass mirror and their flame of life like the flame of a light in a windless place in their graphic language. Some of the Christian saints also sought that condition. The philosophy of quietism as enunciated by Molinos is this: "The phenomenon of consciousness is least within our power. The less sense of proprietorship we had in a thought or action, the less it was the fruit of our deliberate will, the more certain might we be that it was divinely inspired. But what state of mind is most likely to be visited by these spontaneous illuminations? It is the state of soft and savoury sleep of nothingness where the soul is content to fold its hands and wait in dreamy musings till the message comes. It is in this state that we attain disinterested love which is the hallmark of sanctity."* William James says: "When all is said and done we are in the end absolutely dependent on the Universe; and into sacrifices and surren-

ders of some sort, deliberately looked at and accepted, we are drawn and pressed as into our only permanent positions of repose." There is much that is true in this philosophy and there is much that is untrue. Quietism has been succeeded in Europe and America by mind-cure and faith-healing. Their basis is the quieting of the mind. The impression I am well or have been made well by divine power induced by suggestion from another or by auto-suggestion when it quiets the mind disturbed by disease has a most beneficent healing power. The suggestion to be effectual must be deep enough to have reached the subliminal consciousness. Cures certainly take place, especially in nervous affections and improvements in all kinds of maladies take place, because the quieting of the mind, troubled by the anxieties and the brain-disturbances consequent on disease, produces health-giving effects. Again the feeling that I am well or that I am being made well by supernatural power, if deep enough may probably bring to play those subtle powers of life over matter which are being always manifested even in the lowest forms. However that may be the quieting of the mind in a healthy person produces extraordinary results. Like deep sleep it gives strength and energy not possessed before. The state itself is considered to be *Susupti* or dreamless sleep when an individual becomes identical with Brahman according to the Upanishads and the Yoga philosophy, and on waking he remembers only that he had experienced ineffable happiness.

The quietist however makes a mistake when he supposes that his will-power has nothing to do with the phenomena attending mental quiet. Indeed it is the will-power latent in the inner layers of mind, the unconscious exercise of which produces all supernatural phenomena, which can not be explained by mere physical causes. The magnetic fluid issuing from the body of the mesmerist or the man of prayers and incantations can heal certain diseases. A sensory impression can increase the internal secretion of glands and influence the mechanism of the body. Fear and rage and grief can keep the digestive functions in abeyance and a person can remain unaffected in bodily powers for a long time when under their influence. These are apparently effects of physical causes but it is the latent will which in many cases directs and moulds the change in the body. Cures may also occur through hope and faith and apparently in a quiet state of the mind. But it must not be supposed that these occur without the exercise of active will-power. The fact is hope and faith and quiet give a strength to subjective thought and will exercised unconsciously which produced the physical change necessary to effect the cure. Biology has demonstrated how the latent will-power of the living being, which is called the attribute of purposiveness attending all life, will produce changes in the colour and the constitution of the body. The matter has been discussed in Chapter IV, where it has been shown that the creative power to a limited extent attends life. But ad-

mitting all this physiological basis of apparently supernatural cures and phenomena, there still remain certain marvellous phenomena which can not be attributed to known physical causes and which it is difficult to deny are attributable to supernatural agencies. Clairvoyance, clairsaudience and the like may be found explainable by subtle natural powers and physical causes but there are phenomena even more subtle than these.

There are four conditions in mysticism. The first is the common one of mental derangement in hysteria, insanity, hallucination and supernatural possession when the mental activity acting on the lower subliminal consciousness is exceedingly great and prevails over normal surface consciousness and produces most fantastic pictures and impressions in the mind and other results. The second is the state of mind dominated by suggestion proceeding from another person or object, book and the like or by auto-suggestion. The third is the state of quiet produced by drink and hemp, laudanum and ether or by peculiar exercises producing a sense of unity and joyousness, the highest form of which is considered by the Hindu mystics to be *Susupti* or deep sleep, or by long habit and exercise of strong will. The fourth is the state of mind of the philosopher, the mathematician or the scientist who in thought becomes dead to all the senses and oblivious of the outer world loses his surface-consciousness and reaches the subliminal consciousness. Buddha knew better than Molinos. Nirvana was not "the soft and savoury sleep

of nothingness " "where the soul is content to fold its hands and wait in dreamy musing till the message comes ". There was no dreamy musing. It was pure thought which realized the nothingness of all things and had no dreamy musings and waited for no messages. Buddha knew that when the subliminal consciousness was reached, to weaker and less wakeful men came dreamy musings and messages from Mara, the evil One, who controls all material desires, as they sometimes came to him. It was his victory over the disturbances and temptations of Mara which led to Bodhi or the perfect enlightenment. This victory over the Evil One is recorded of Siva, Buddha and Jesus. Luther and other saints of ancient times also had tough fights with the cloven-footed Power.* The apparitions are common to all persons reaching the subliminal consciousness. They may be true or may be creations of the disturbed mind but the important fact is that truth is attained when the disturbance from these apparitions are overcome and the strong thinking man attains to truth—to the real.

The wonders of the subliminal consciousness are manifold. Apparitions and visions, transformation of the body, telepathy, clairvoyance and clairsaudience are real phenomena attending it. It is possible that superior and inferior spirits may be reflected on it. Material objects are moved. Diseases are

*How apparitions are suggested by books is exemplified by the cloven foot of the Devil seen by Christians and the tail of the monkey-god as seen by Hindu saints.

cured and truths discovered and a moral and spiritual exaltation reached beyond the reach of ordinary men. But no body need seek it. It is not a healthy and natural state except in the exceptionally strong thoughtful man. Even with such men the results may be disastrous. The greatest of all saints, the learned, the acute logician, the purest and most loved and most loveable of all men, Chaitanya, because of the inherited epilepsy, which probably induced his holy trances, with all his powers and great pity and love of God ended his days in misery consequent on a nervous constitution shattered by these unhealthy exercises. The healthy condition, healthy mindedness, is compatible with saintliness, and it should not be supposed that saintliness is not compatible with healthy-mindedness, as thought William James. Saintliness would in that case be a disease and religion a horrible chimera.

I have considered these phases of life in detail only because they show that in the inmost layer of consciousness there are extraordinary latent powers, power over matter such as moving of material objects from a distance, seeing and hearing and smelling in a manner not within the range of the ordinary exercise of the senses and apparently impossible to them, and lastly because it is there the *better* is evolved. It is there we feel the touch of the Father. Let no man or woman mistake my meaning. The excitements of the strenuous modern man, with his hustle and hurry, wines and places of amusements, the money-making, place-hunting and pleasure-seeking are un-

healthy in the extreme. They are little removed from hysteria and insanity. The *better* is not evolved there nor is there the touch of the spirit. That is evolved in the quiet of the strenuous effort of the healthy normal life. Quiet and strenuous effort are apparently contradictory but in reality there is a substratum of great quiet in healthy natural strenuous effort. It is thus that in the common ordinary healthy life the *better* is evolved. It is there that the touch of the Lord of life is felt. The subliminal consciousness is reached by us in health better than in disease. Buddha, the greatest of seers, established the fact in a land darkened with the terrors and pleasantries of mysticism. The diseases and the disturbances must be studied and investigated like broken ground by the mineralogist, for it is there that we get sight of the seams of pure gold lying under the surface; but they must be recognized as diseases. We are concerned with the *better* and with God. They are attainable only in health.

Positive religion may do without visions and mysterious phenomena. But religious men have dealt with them from time immemorial and they cannot be ignored. Even the most acute of mathematicians, scientists and philosophers have recognized that conviction is sometimes produced in our minds by something other than the reason of our wide-awake existence. "The heart has its reasons," says Pascal, "of which the reason knows nothing." That only expresses the undoubted truth that in a layer of consciousness deeper than our wide-awake

consciousness we have cognition of facts, the reality of which we are as much convinced of as of the facts conveyed to us by our sense-organs. We can not deny the testimony of our heart or inner consciousness, just as we cannot deny the testimony of our senses. Such testimony however is true only in health and in the normal condition. When the body and mind are diseased and in an abnormal condition, or when custom and habit and faith obsess our minds, such testimony is open to doubt and must be tested by criterions other than mere cognition. The subliminal consciousness is not quite dormant and dead in a healthy and normal state of the mind. It works and gives what is called by the philosophers "the value" to cognitions. As it cannot be said that all that is seen by a hysteric or hypnotic patient is unreal, so it is not true to say that all that is perceived by the Yogee or the hypnotized person is wholly unreal. Persons in this condition have to my personal knowledge sometimes begun by testifying to the correctness of their experience by relating actual facts by chairvoyance which were verified soon. The wonderful gods and angels and visions thereafter described by the subject, who was all the time dead to the outside world of sense, might be true or might be false. But all these phenomena can not be rejected as wholly false in their very nature, for they have sometimes led to higher truth and nobler conduct or to the *better*.

The quiet
ordinary re-
ligious work-
ing man's life.

Every man has a mystic side in his nature. The religious man has that side more developed than

others. It manifests itself when the energies of the mind are least dissipated. The common religious labouring man, though he may make strenuous effort, is less disturbed in his mind than the immoral ambitious irreligious man with his mind distracted by many things. The religious man, who does his duty in life, believing himself to be a servant and son of God, has little distractions and is a greater Yogee than the gazer on the tip of the nose or on the crystal. He also attains to a quiet greater than what can be acquired by the practise of any cult of quietism. Even his sorrows and anxieties lead him away from the distractive of the world and make him seek God who gives him rest. Belief in the good father is the greatest Yoga one can perform. It leads to the very base of life, to the mystic regions of consciousness and life, where the *better* is produced, and to God. Every truly religious man, while he contemns all visions and the like and all supernatural powers, is a mystic. His mysticism should however be of the healthy mind which leads to truth and all that is good and noble.

It is a fact that most serious religious men have had more or less mystic experiences. Religious men seek the unseen God who is a spirit according to the idea they have of the spirit. That idea was gross and material in early times and has been becoming every day finer and finer. Seeking after the spirit leads one to the subliminal consciousness. Originally the Saman who developed abnormal and thus diseased conditions of the mind was considered the

true religious man. There can even now be no saintship without uncommon powers and experiences. But without the abnormal condition of the mind of the saint, there may still be a perception of the spiritual in a healthy normal mind. Many common men in their time of need have felt the touch of the Mother who loves and helps. Very often in abnormal conditions of the mind, the beast, the evil that is in us, assumes the form of angels and gods and deludes us. But angel or god, the love of none is wholly unselfish. The wide-awake person is suspicious of every spiritual phenomenon and looks for God in the ordinary every-day world. When any extraordinary phenomena occur to him, he says with the Upanishada "He is not this, He is not this." But nevertheless he is convinced that there is the Helper by his side,—He in whose love there is no taint or selfishness. Help comes to every man sometimes in supra-normal ways. The hard matter-of-fact man explains the phenomena by natural causes. The religious man ascribes them to God. He often ascribes natural events to God. His mind is so inclined. No man or woman would be able to have or to retain any love to any person, if he or she did not wrongly believe in many actions as proceeding from his love. The religious man's love to God is likewise stimulated and kept up by his belief, not infrequently unfounded, in the happening of events out of the special regard of God for him. The religious man who is able to have a *little* love for the Father, is rewarded by the feeling of His love and companionship in his inmost waking consciousness. Mysticism is thus not without value.

Buddha reprobated all mystic powers and practices, but his hard superhuman intellect had to be made pure and unclouded by passions and desires before he apprehended great truths. He recommended constant wakefulness of the mind. The truly religious man also ought to avoid all unhealthy and abnormal conditions of the mind in which the true God is not attainable and be always wakeful. By the exercise of his unclouded intellect and above all things by disinterested love to God, which is the most difficult thing to attain in life and which is attained by constant service and which is absolutely indispensable to any perception of Him, he feels his inmost consciousness vibrate to the touch of the most loving of all friends—the touch of One whose relationship is closer and more real to him and inexpressibly sweeter than any other relationship that he knows of.

CHAPTER XII.

THE POSITIVE RULE OF RIGHT CONDUCT.

We have described the motives of right conduct enunciated by materialists and utilitarians and socialists. Theists base right conduct on loving God and doing His will and loving one's neighbour as one's self. Atheists also lay down a rule of noble conduct. We should here attempt to lay down a rule of conduct for life which is good and noble and which is consistent with positive religion and conducive to the growth of the spiritual and the perception of the true God by man.

The motive
of right con-
duct.

In the materialistic ideal, love of one's neighbour is not indispensable. Utility will suffice. Utility is a real, tangible and true motive power for a sensible man. But it is not sufficient. Murder may be prevented by the fear of punishment, but it would be better, if it were prevented by the growing sense of pity and love in all men. Indeed, without love as the supreme motive power, the arm of the law or the will of human society would not be sufficient to prevent murders altogether only on the ground of utility. There will be no sufficient motive to refrain from secret undetectable murder, theft or adultery. The Christian ideal suffices. But it also is enforced by fear, not merely of temporary punishment but of eternal punishment. Only Buddha,

the great Master. taught that all fear is vile superstition. Man is free and not the slave of or "food for, the gods". Man punishes or rewards himself. Every evil act carries its own punishment with it. Fear not rely on thyself and work out thy own salvation by thy own efforts. The gods are powerless. So say Buddha and Hindu philosophers. The doctrine that every evil action carries its own punishment with it, if, believed, would be a sufficient deterrent of evil. But what is the ground for believing in the truth of this doctrine, says the Utilitarian? Experience, says the Buddhist. That is a matter of controversy and can not be considered a positive indisputable doctrine.

It must be admitted that fear as a motive power for the conduct of life is vile and should be eschewed by all generous minds. It cannot be true and sufficient, for it is ignoble. Right conduct out of fear is mere hypocrisy. It is like the chastity of the women in the sultan's harem or the virtue of prisoners in jail. What then is the true motive power of noble life and in what does noble conduct consist?

The Christian, the Buddhist and the Hindu all agree in denouncing the pleasures of sense and worldly things as ephemeral and of no moment and enjoin ascetism as the only means for the attainment of the supreme object of noble life. The Hindu, who has not given up the world before, on his death-bed goes through a formality of renunciation of the world, with which reluctantly he has to part shortly after. But the modern European with a greater regard for truth says that so long as there is

human existence, the seeking after greater physical pleasure and comfort and obtaining it for one's own self and for others is the supreme object of life and not the cutting down of pleasures and comforts. There is no hypocrisy here. It is frankly natural and true. Buddha said and said truly that pain, old age and death are inevitable and surely overtake man as a consequence of desire, and he attempted to abolish them altogether. The modern man says : we shall alleviate physical pain, we shall prevent senility and postpone death by science, and we shall increase the pleasures of life. The object of the modern scientist is as high as that of Buddha and is more real.

What man
has learned
by bitter ex-
perience.

The world after many thousands of years of earnest thought and endeavour, after suffering untold miseries, fears and oppressions, after men and children without number have been sacrificed to cruel gods and evil spirits, after women innumerable had been immolated for the supposed pleasure of their dead lords, after untold millions had suffered the the pain and degradation of the slavery of the few, after man had been subjected to the abject terror of the fire of hell and of the displeasure of gods and ghosts and made to undergo cruel penances, privations and punishments by priests and religious fanatics, jugglers, magicians, spiritists and philosophers, have come to apprehend (1) that fear is an ignoble motive and the objects that terrified so long are mere shadows of the dark night which light destroys, (2) that freedom of thought and action is the birth-right

of man, (3) the pleasures and comforts of life are good and should be sought and increased and disease and physical pain should be alleviated, if not abolished, (4) the pleasures and the comfort of the many must be sought above all things, as being necessary for alleviating pain and advancing the happiness not only of the multitude but also of the individual, (5) the impossible and mischievous attempt to smother altogether all desires must be given up and the pleasures of the senses and the intellect must be increased, intensified and purified. More beautiful painting, higher music, nobler literature, higher science, better knowledge of the laws of nature, body and mind must be secured.

But let there be no mistake. The hope of reward or pleasure in this life or after death can not be considered as a good and sufficient motive for right conduct. If it be so considered, goodness would be another name for prudence. Prudence and goodness are very different to and sometimes contradictory of one another. They correspond to the two guiding principles of life mentioned before. Prudence is the ordinary reason, which secures the preservation and pleasure of the existing organism. Goodness corresponds to the other principle which leads to the evolution of the higher life and the higher species. Prudence is the reason which materialists analyse to be nothing but material and which has cognizance only of the material needs of life. Goodness is what is approved by the spiritual in our life and which in a mysterious manner do-

Goodness
and prudence
analysed.

minates our reason and our being. Prudence is intended to secure our pleasure and happiness and is as a rule successful in doing so, though sometimes it leads to unhappiness and pains. There are philosophers and virtuous men who consider that goodness is its own reward, because it secures a mysterious happiness for the virtuous. But these philosophers are all disillusioned at the end, like Brutus who a little before his death is said to have cried out, "O virtue, I have worshipped thee as substantial good, but I find thou art an empty name". Those that expect pleasure and happiness out of goodness must meet with like disappointment. Virtue practised in the hope of reward is only prudence. But it is true that goodness does lead to ultimate happiness. Kant's opinion that virtue is the supreme good (*bonum supremum*), because "it is the supreme condition of all our pursuit of happiness" and that it can be defined as "worthiness to be happy" is correct only if virtue be regarded as such conduct as is required by the laws of life leading to its progress.

We have seen before how biology teaches us that there are three dominating instincts, namely (1) the inclination to preserve the individual organism intact and to exercise all its senses, (2) the inclination to preserve the species, (3) the inclination to evolve a form of life better than that of the species, and also higher and finer powers and greater spirituality in life. The second instinct is more powerful than the first and the third dominates the first two.

Positive rule
corresponds
with principle
of biology.

Pleasure and happiness, says the biologist, " are the correlatives of actions which conduce to the welfare of the organism " *i. e.*, which best accord with the inclinations dominating life. The three dominant inclinations of life are real and true wisdom would teach us to regulate our life in accordance with them and to satisfy them all, giving preference to the third over the second and the second over the first. The first is more patent, more on the surface than the second and the second is similarly more patent and more on the surface than the third. Thus we seek our own happiness by the indulgence of our senses and vanity or selfish instincts, apparently above every other thing. But we are nevertheless constrained against this patent inclination to yield to the other two instincts. As life becomes higher, the second and third instincts come more and more to the surface. Positive religion bases the conduct of life it recommends on the broad principle thus laid down by biology,

Happiness is surely the happiness of one's own self. As life advances in the scale of existence, it finds that it also consists in seeking the happiness of others. In the lowest forms of life pleasure was felt at the pain of others, victory meaning the defeat of another. Even now the noblest of men have not been able to shake off that inherited instinct. But reason and higher life have declared that sort of pleasure as spurious.

Happiness
defined,

Happiness means the highest enjoyment of the senses and of the mind and of the spirit, if the

last two can be differentiated from the senses. Now with the growth of man, the senses are requiring higher, nobler, more refined enjoyment. Absolutely-grosser forms of sensual pleasure no longer please. Every day the senses to be pleased are requiring forms more delicate, more unlike to matter and more akin to the spirit. The savage is pleased with a daub. To him a picture by Raphael has no meaning. The civilized man abhors a daub and wants pictures finer than even Raphael's masterpieces. The physical effect of the vibrations of ether or light-rays on nerve-centres or on the white matter of the brain cannot explain the fact that the daub and the glaring colours please the savage natural man but absolutely displease the cultured man. A Raphael would be absolutely meaningless and jejune to an uncultured person but it would afford exquisite pleasure to the eye of the cultured person. The eye, as man becomes more cultured, requires more perfect, more spiritual forms for its pleasure. It will slowly become wholly spiritualized. Similarly, the music which pleases the savage is disagreeable discord to the civilized man. The continuous beating of the tomtom by his uncultured neighbour is torture in eastern countries to the European. The music of Beethoven or Mozart would be dull, jejune, and meaningless to the uncultured man but it is a source of exquisite pleasure to the cultured European. Finer, grander, more spiritual forms of music, the ear requires for its pleasure with the progress of man. The ear also will slowly become

wholly spiritualized. The senses of taste and smell are also becoming every day finer. The sexual instinct, which in the case of the savage man is as gross and bestial as in the lower animals, is slowly evolving into the fine rose of comradeship, with the sweetest scent of friendship and the highest spiritual love between free man and free woman. As regards the mind, it has so grown that its potentialities have come to be recognized as infinite. Higher and nobler and more spiritual poetry and other literature than what the primitive man could have any conception of, and science so noble as is about to make man master of the forces of nature, like the gods, have been evolved. There is no limit to the achievements of the mind.

The materialistic doubter may say that the pleasures of the senses have not become keener by this apparent progress of man and he would like to revert to the state of nature. The answer is clear. Sensual enjoyment of the refined man has all the pleasures of the gross animal without its disgusting avidity and lust and has in addition something which is exquisite but undefinable, of which the mere animal has no idea. It is surely nature that gives the most spiritual enjoyment to the eye and the ear. Reverting to nature has however, a peculiar meaning to some. The epicure, enfeebled by gross enjoyment, wants to go back to nature. Going back to nature, if it means going back to the beast, is certainly ignoble and is productive of more sorrow than happiness. Nature includes matter, intellect and spirit, the two latter

being more important than the first. Philosophers differ from the materialists and go to the other extreme and say all desire of the pleasures of the senses is evil.

It is the sense-perceptions that lead us to the spiritual. When the living being sees and discriminates, when it apprehends beauty, when it creates works of art, when it hears and discriminates the notes he hears, when it apprehends the harmony and melody, when it makes new music, it transcends its material nature and partakes of the spiritual. The ascetic philosophers, who contemned the senses did not see that the sense-perceptions lead to the spirit ; without them all would be dead matter.

It has been shown before that desireless action is an impossible ideal. Desirelessness is incompatible with life and all perception. But it must be said that the philosophers, ancient and modern, had very good reason for insisting on desirelessness as leading to happiness. It is absolutely true that desirelessness would destroy all sorrow, and the absence of clinging to life destroys all fear. The universe of life is full of sorrows and fears. Sorrows of the body, of disappointment, of loss of dear ones and of death. Fears are also manifold : fears of sorrow and death, fears of being destroyed and oppressed by the strong and the powerful of the seen and probably of the unseen world. The sure remedy against sorrows and fears is desirelessness and contempt of death and the conviction of the supremacy and independence of the self. All dependence and

fear of the stronger lead to sorrow. The resolution to rely on one's self and not to be afraid of the strong and the powerful by considering their intrinsic weakness and their inability to hurt the unselfish spirit may destroy sorrow and fear. The philosophers and saints have advocated this rule of conduct. But this rule can be adopted only by the elect few. For the great mass of men, excepting the material pleasures, sorrow and fear will remain as the only incentives to higher life. But surely they darken their lives, and how many there are, who would not be glad to get rid of their life in consequence? For the great mass of men, the philosophic life of Buddha is not possible. Millions of men became Buddhist Bhikkus or Christian monks and got rid of much sorrow, anxiety and fear. But the world of life would cease, if all adopted that course. Therefore, even if the ideal of Buddha be true, positive philosophy, which deals with life as it is and its progress, can not adopt it in its entirety. Indeed, desirelessness is only a philosopher's ideal which is based partly on truth. Physiology tells us that without desire the exercise of the senses is impossible. Muirhead rightly says: "final and complete victory over it by virtue would involve its own destruction along with the destruction of desire". Life as has been shown before is impossible without desire. The ascetic ideal though noble is based upon an imaginary and unreal foundation. Positive philosophy depends on the Law evolving higher and higher life through sorrow and pain, fear and death. As the powers of life spiritualize, sorrows

and fears gradually lose their terrors. Wisdom in itself will destroy much sorrow and fear. The consciousness of self, which partakes more of matter and is in its origin wholly dependent on matter and thus more subject to the pains, which that dependence implies in the lower forms of life, becomes less material and dependent, as the higher forms of life are evolved. Desire ordinarily means desire of material pleasures. This desire also becomes less and less. Pure self-consciousness becomes greater as the higher form is evolved, for it becomes more independent. The grosser and more material forms of life, like trees, are less self-conscious than the higher forms. The material part of life is by the law of evolution gradually destroyed. This process of destruction causes pain. There would therefore be much greater pain in the grosser forms of life, if their consciousness were equal to that of the higher forms. Self-consciousness is in the lower forms of life by a merciful law in its intensity less, as the pain required to be endured is greater. With the evolution of the higher forms, the necessity for the endurance of pain becomes less. The less material a living being, it becomes less amenable to pain though more sensitive to it. The absence of desire for material objects and of the clinging to the gross material part of life shows more spiritual life. The habit of getting rid of the desire for gross material objects and clinging to gross physical existence should therefore be cultivated by the wise, in anticipation of the more spiritual life, they would soon

attain to, as it would avoid much sorrow and fear. The higher the life, the less material the organism, the greater are its self-consciousness and its sensitiveness to pain. But the higher life and the greater self-consciousness mean greater power over the material world. Matter is food for the spirit, though the spirit is more sensitive than matter. Higher reason and greater spirituality however, tend to make pain powerless to affect a person. The material nervous constitution of the organism becomes more sensitive in the higher forms of life and gives higher enjoyment of the pleasures of the senses, of beauty and music and the like, but at the same time it perceives more the dangers, which envelope its life over which it has no control and which make it tremble, and it feels the pains of decay, disease, disappointment and the loss of the dear ones much more keenly. Indeed, it is only in the higher forms of life that suicide is possible. But it is also true that the more sensitive system, though it may lead to suicide, also leads to the willing sacrifice of life by the noble individual. Every rational being, if convinced of the transitory character of its life, knowing its many terrors and sorrows, would commit suicide. The greater majority of men and women have no faith in any or a better existence hereafter and are fully convinced of the manifold evils of life but still they cling to life till the last. In that they are like the lower animals and trees and other still lower organisms. Reason alone can dictate a conduct leading to suicide or Nirvana. As long as self-consciousness is dominated by

matter, men will act as beasts and other lower organisms and refrain from suicide. This principle has been imprinted on life. But when reason dominates self-consciousness and life, what is there to prevent suicide, unless reason is convinced that the continuance of life is better and happier than its discontinuance? We expect that reason will some day dominate life. What then will preserve it? It is highly probable that in that stage of the evolution of life, reason will make it clear that life is worth preserving, otherwise the sentient world will refuse to exist. Reason as it grows makes manifest more and more the independence and power of the individual. Desire and clinging to matter, the original constituents of life, make us dependent. When reason will dominate life, contempt for ignoble material desires will accompany it. In this sense, desirelessness of the philosophers is good. Reason should be cultivated by all means and it will lead us to the regions of fearlessness. The worth and the independence of the individual of all material fetters should be meditated upon and they will be manifest to us more and more, as we advance in the scale of life. Some philosophers and seers by the habit of much contemplation, it is recorded, attained to that high state of mind. Hypnotism shows the great undeveloped powers of the individual over matter. The great seers had greater powers than the modern hypnotizers, for reason and spirituality predominated in their lives and feelings were kept down. Thus they were more independent of material fetters than we are. It is not possible for

ordinary men like us to attain to their philosophic mind. We must go through pain and sorrow and fear, through labour and trouble, to a higher life. But the philosophic mind gives a certain degree of independence and power over matter and sorrow and should be sought by such as can, though it should not be forgotten that without desire there can be no action and no life. It is the gradual spiritualizing of the senses and the sense-perceptions, leading not to desirelessness but to the desire for pure spiritual enjoyment, that is the true and real good in life. That can be attained only by much labour and pain.

The wonderful progress of mankind has been achieved by the strenuous effort of all and the life-blood of a few men of genius, who it must not be forgotten as a rule, mark only the highest elevation of the general high level of the progress of their fellow-men. The strenuous labour of every man has thus brought about the result. It has been brought about by much pain and travail. Nature and the human mind are always in travail, bringing forth into existence, finer forms, and are amply recompensed by the pleasure of their birth, like mothers. Therefore strenuous effort and labour are causes of pleasure.

Effort.

The first thing necessary for the ideal of life is therefore self-culture, culture of the body and the mind and of the spirit. A healthy, well-developed body is the first requisite of happiness. Stronger body, more sensitive senses, and retention of youth and health till death and the postponment of death

Culture.

to a period longer than is general at present, these are the objects we should secure. To this end the individual has to strive, to give to the body laborious training and to impose on himself an apparently disagreeable, but in reality healthy and ultimately pleasant, self-restraint in the exercise of the senses. To this end society has to bring about sanitary conditions of life, better houses, healthier surroundings, purer and more sufficient food and water for all, except the idle. To this end, the scientist has to combat disease, decay and death. To this end, the true statesman should devote all his thought and energies to get for the people sufficient food, health, education, freedom and dignity, which include the equality and fraternity of all men and, I would add, all women.

The culture of the mind is indispensable for the increase of the happiness of man. Mind and the senses go together. The refined eye and ear and spiritual love are results of the culture of the mind and of the spirit. The merely intellectual being will not attain to the truest beauty or the highest love. But the culture of the mind is indispensable for all progress. The culture of the mind is now attained by painful methods. Subjecting one to the laborious process of education is not pleasant at present. But with improved methods of education, intellectual culture would be a continuous joy. But with all this prospect before us, laborious effort and pain shall nevertheless always remain the main causes of the progress of the living being. As for

the inventor and the discoverer, the great scientist the great philosopher, and the benefactor of his kind there will remain exceeding labour and effort, sometimes so great as to break the individual, body and mind. For the great mass of people also, there shall always be exceeding labour, trouble and pain, for the highest good proceeds only out of strenuous effort and of sacrifice, out of the crucifixion of the Son of God.

The next thing necessary is to attain to the frame of mind which conduces to the peace and contentment of the individual and the happiness of the man. What are generally called immorality, falsehood, larceny, envy, malice, and lust do not conduce to the peace and contentment of the individual and certainly not of the society in which he lives. They should therefore be eschewed. The moral law should be obeyed. But it should not be obeyed for mysterious reasons. For the moral law, the materialist can find no proof. It is not necessary to go to any mysterious law to prove that immorality should be avoided. What is generally recognised as immoral is incompatible with the happiness of the individual and of society at large. The moral law and its natural sanction, which it carries with itself, exist. But on utilitarian grounds, it should be supported. Mysterious and imaginary spiritual grounds, which lead to fanciful standards of morality, should always be avoided. Indeed the mysterious grounds for being moral lead to gloomy austerity and to the fear of the dreadful hell-fire, which are destructive of the growth

of the free man. The true spiritual grounds are not the fanciful grounds of the priests. It is not necessary for my purpose to define them and to rely on them. If I attempted to do so, it may make my discourse liable to be considered as fanciful. It is sufficient for the present purpose to say that truth, purity, benevolence and love are real and are the most beautiful things in existence. Their reality becomes doubtful, if it is attempted to be proved by fanciful grounds, and they cease to be beautiful, if they are forced upon men by fear of the hell-fire.

I have spoken of the negative virtues, which are easily attained. But the positive virtue of benevolence is more necessary for the happiness of the individual and is more difficult of attainment. If one pays money to a poor man in the hope of getting it back a thousandfold in after-life or in heaven, that is mere bargaining. It is not benevolence. Fear and hope of reward are potent motives for being benevolent to all of us. But it should not be imagined that it does not exist without them. There is always an underlying pure benevolence in the charity of the worst of priest-ridden men. The religion of fear of gloomy prophets and saints, Jewish, Christian and Hindu, whose austerities have been the wonder of the world, gives a motive for benevolence in the hope of reward after death and enforces it by fear of hell if it is not practised. It is ignoble but it has rendered great service to man by imposing on him a habit of benevolence. But man will soon outgrow the necessity of fetters and the rod of the taskmaster.

Pure benevolence will be found a source of unalloyed joy to be sought after. It is not easily attained. Health of body and mind, much thought, much refinement, the clear sight, which of a certainty produces the exceeding compassion of a Buddha, much spirituality and, if I may be allowed to say, much prayer, can give to the animal man, the godly mind of benevolence. Benevolence is now more barter than goodness but it will in course of time, with the growth of the free man, become pure and more divine than human. The materialist would say benevolence is based on selfishness and is good because it pleases. Why it pleases, he cannot say. Buddha Ghosha, the great Buddhist writer gives a spiritual explanation of it when he describes the Buddha mind as one made peaceful by exceeding compassion. Goodness is a source of pleasure. It leads to happiness. Were it otherwise, none but the fool would seek it. The cultivation of benevolence is therefore necessary on non-spiritual grounds.

So far I have gone with the materialist. I am anxious to make my position agree with his, for all he says is based upon palpable facts and is thus not liable to error on account of fancies and phantasies, upon which, it must be admitted, most, if not all, religions base their ideals. The conflict between the professors of the various religions is well known. Every one of them calls the ideals of the rest false and fanciful and asserts that his own ideals are obviously true. It follows therefore that all are agreed that all ideals, except their own, are based on fancy, and the

Culture of
spirit and
worship of
God neces-
sary.

the materialist therefore says that the presumption is that all are false. It is therefore safer to tread on solid earth with the materialist, so far as it is possible to do so, and to examine our positions by the tangible test of reason and positive philosophy. I am glad to find that I agree with the materialist so far, though I have shown before that for the evolution of the *better* something higher than reason is necessary. But saying everything in his favour, if there is a life hereafter, if there is a world of spirit, if there is a God, facts the assumption of which I have found necessary, if not proved, the culture of the spirit and the worship of God are of supreme importance for the attainment of the true ideal of life. It is the spiritual forms that the progress of man is evolving, as I have shown before. Every effort at progress is an effort to attain the spiritual. Probably the more practical, the more natural and physical and more tangible methods lead to spirituality better than the so called spiritual exercises, which, so far as they are based on fancy and fear and gloomy austerity, should be avoided. The nervous constitution becomes high strung by fasting and prayer and watching and it is said certain powers of healing and prevision are thus attained and what are called spiritual powers evolved. Buddha prohibited all these and prescribed deep contemplation. Mesmeric healing, telepathy, clairvoyance and the like are unexplained physical phenomena, which when explained may show that the spirit of man may to a large extent become independent of the physical

fetters of the body. But higher spiritually is attained by deep thought, by self-sacrificing mercy and love and by perfect purity of conduct. These lead us to the path of the realization of the relationship between God and man, which is the supreme object of life. If God exists, it may be possible to hear His voice and to feel His touch. It is undoubtedly true that a few superhuman men have alleged that they felt the touch of the source of all beauty, goodness and joy. They have testified to the fact. We do not know whether we would be justified in relying on their testimony. The materialist says it is fancy. But here many would be inclined to believe Daniel, Jesus and Chaitanya as more truthful than he. All prophets and saints have been represented to be gods or god-inspired, and their words and actions have been considered supernatural by their followers. So it is difficult to ascertain what they really said and felt and how far they were right. But still there is a consensus of opinion that they did assert some sort of direct perception through the senses of the Supreme Being. The time will surely come, with the evolution of the spiritual man, when every one will have the direct proof. It is probably true that every good, pure, intellectual man, who like Jacob has ventured to wrestle with the Lord for whole nights, who has sacrificed his all for the love of God, has received some tangible proof. The very best men of all races, of all countries, of all times have testified to the fact and borne witness to the wonderful love of God. To positive philosophy there is indeed no direct proof of the senses perceptible to all, but

human testimony has always been regarded as good evidence and a judge guided by the strictest rules of positive philosophy would be justified in basing his verdict on such evidence, if it satisfies him, as being trustworthy. But even then, I doubt whether the senses of man, as they are now, can have any apprehension of the pure spirit. The rarity, if not the utter absence, of such direct apprehension must of necessity be on account of the want of proper sight and the imperfect development of spirituality in man in his present stage of evolution. The ant cannot see God, nor can man, who is little better than an ant. It is when man is true spirit that he can apprehend the universal spirit. It may have happened in moments of rare exaltation in the case of supermen that they had some preception of God or of some high spiritual being who seemed to them to be God. But poor undeveloped beings like us cannot see God but nevertheless find on reflection life to be unbearable, if the loving and merciful God is not with them in this very humble tenement of theirs. But sentimental grounds have no place in positive philosophy. I have however found before the assumption of God necessary for the highest and the truest ideal of life. It is not inconsistent with the strictest demands of positive philosophy to say that to be able to love God, is surely the highest ideal of life, as we know it to be.

Now let us consider the matter a little further. We have shown that our sense-perceptions are

gradually spiritualizing or, if that term be objected to, becoming purer and more refined with the progress of man. The daub that pleased the savage no longer pleases civilized man. The Raphael that pleases now will cease to please in time and more spiritual pictures will be produced. The ideal of the beautiful is developing into forms ever becoming finer and purer and less gross and material. The eye-sight now finds suplimity and beauty in the starry firmament, flowers and other things on earth and feasts on pleasures of which the savage had no idea. Where will this ever-growing idea of pure beauty stop? The utterly beautiful is the goal. If there is any pleasure in the perception of the partially beautiful now, how keen, how great would be the pleasure at the perception of the utterly beautiful One. Similarly, the music of the savage is discord to the refined man. The music of Beethoven gives more pleasure to the ear, that can apprehend its symphony, than the savage has any idea of. To go further, the music of the voice of the best beloved is sweeter than all music, says the mystic devotee. As we have not heard it, we shall only look to the coming of the time when our ears shall apprehend the sweetest and most spiritual of music and enjoy the pleasure derived from it and know its Source.

This process of development is going on with all the senses and also with the intellect. The intellect now finds out the similarity and dissimilarity and the beauty of forms of matter; the rules

of matter and the mysteries of nature. The time will come when the mysteries found by the intellect of man after centuries of trouble will be objects of apprehension by the finer senses to be evolved hereafter. But the intellect will still seek finer forms and deeper mysteries, which will give to man higher and greater pleasure in the effort and in the attainment. The final goal of the intellect is appreciation of the finest forms of matter and thought and the attainment of the direct vision of truth by the spiritual eye, which is the third eye, which Siva, the Hindu God, is supposed to possess. The third eye, or a sense more spiritual than those we possess now, may be evolved in time and lead us to higher knowledge. The intellect will never be satisfied until it solves the deepest of all mysteries. The solution of one mystery will lead to another and deeper mystery. There is no end to this ceaseless seeking. The continuous progress of the intellect and the ceaseless seeking after truth are objects wholly noble and afford a sufficient purpose to life.

There is pleasure in truth and purity, in goodness and love. The finer idea of these brings higher and greater pleasure. The mind is only satisfied with the truest truth, with the purest purity, and the best and utterly unselfish goodness. And we have seen before how there is nothing more truly desirable, except the utterly lovable and the truly loving One.

Personal
interest.

Beauty and music, wisdom and goodness, purity and love are desired by the elements that constitute life. It is however the individual that gives meaning

to them. A beautiful picture pleases on account of the sense of appreciating ideal beauty which is growing in life but which arises in the mind from its being found in material and living objects. The growth of the sense of beauty and the like can be explained only by the fact that the power of evolving the sense of higher and higher beauty and the like is an element of life. Descartes asserted that the idea of absolute perfection can exist only in reference to the perfect God. However that may be, without a person other than ourselves, all beauty will be meaningless and there will be no goodness. Further, without a Person above and beyond the species man, the greater sense of beauty, the greater spirituality, the *better*, will not have any meaning and will not be evolved. It is the individual which gives meaning and interest to life. Beauty in a landscape interests a person. Beauty in a picture gives further interest and beauty in a living person still greater interest and beauty in a person, whom he loves and who loves him, gives one the highest and most real interest. The interest which an artist or a poet feels in dead natural objects does not give sufficient interest to life. Keats and Byron, Titian and Mozart felt not much interest in their lives. Even wisdom did not give sufficient interest in life to Seneca or Bacon. Most artists, poets and philosophers found their interest in life in seeking after fame, women and wealth. We are more material than spiritual and we are thus all but engrossed with material pleasures. But the spiritual in us exists and even in our material pleasures we acknowledge the supremacy of the spiritual. The real tangible interest in

life is found by the individual in reference to other individuals because life's real interest is not in dead, matter or ideas derived from matter. Buddha and the philosophic ascetics of India aspired to a conduct without interest in matters concerning individual life. Their efforts for the attainment of the impossible did not succeed and led to mysticism and immorality among their followers, when the influence of their high and noble life faded away. The predominance of interest in persons in life asserted itself. The philosophers have however proved that our material and sensual pleasures can give only a momentary interest to life, and have also asserted that there is nothing of permanent interest. If there is nothing to interest in life, it had better disappear. In any case it is intolerable. Life however, is a reality and there is real perennial interest for it, if it is growing and developing into higher forms. That real and perennial interest cannot be given by mere matter or by individuals, who are more like matter than spirit. The never-failing interest in life arises from its relationship to the wholly spiritual and to the perfect Individual, through whose influence the highest forms of beauty, purity, wisdom, goodness and love and other noble spiritual ideas, which have not yet manifested themselves, will be evolved in future. This is merely trying to define the reality approximately. The relationship is perhaps better explained by the influence of the sun in expanding the flower and its beautiful colours or still better by the influence of the idea of form in bringing light into existence, as Buddha assert-

ed, or by the influence of light in developing eye-sight. These are material analogies. The true spiritual analogy is yet beyond the comprehension of man. Man can speak only in metaphors and analogies and make suggestions and approximations. This will not satisfy the enquirer nor does it satisfy me. But we must wait, we cannot but wait.

It will be rightly objected that by admitting the imperfection of our present ethical ideas and their continued growth, we only destroy the existing foundations of morality but do not supply another and truer foundation for it. Observations that morality is "the system of conduct that is in harmony with the underlying purposes of human life," or that moral law is "what determiness the purpose of life" or that "the essential rationality of goodness as obedience to the law of life and as a consequence, the necessity of understanding what this law is and what it requires in a given situation" are "at the root of right conduct" may be true but can not be of much use in determining concrete rules of conduct. For that we must come down to a not very transcendent platform. Morality depends on the individual. Apart from him, the sorrowing, dying, apparently uncared for, poor, utterly pitiable, little thing, the individual human being, morality and virtue have no meaning and thus have no existence. An action is right only in reference to the consciousness of the individual that it is right. The right grows with the individual. Thus the conduct, which, on account of the condition of the society in which a person lives, as well as of other reasons, *seems* right to him, *is* right for him. Sidgwick rightly says

that "we obviously can not distinguish what we believe to be right from what really is" and that "no act can be right for him which the agent does not believe to be so." It is true that our belief that our actions are right or "their effect", as Kant says, "can not give them moral worth," when by moral worth is meant the absolute perfect moral worth. But human morality is the determination by the free man what is right according to him and acting accordingly. Thus a man is bound to carry out the rules of morality, which he at present believes to be right. The ten commandments for a Christian, the noble eight-fold path for a Buddhist, the greatest good of the greatest number for the modern philosopher, are all good rules of morality for those that believe in them. This belief will give place to newer beliefs, as morality grows with humanity. But his present conviction as to what is right is the only morality for the individual. But saying all this, it is still true that morality depends on the ideals and on the yearning in the heart of the individual after perfect goodness. The ideals are therefore all important.

Pain to be regarded as
austerity.

Lastly I must mention here the rule of conduct laid down in Manu, the most ancient of all lawgivers. He lays down the noble philosophic rule that sorrow and pain, failure and disappointment, contumely and injustice, disease and the pangs of death must be considered as Tapas or religious austerity willingly undergone for the attainment of the good. To the believer in the good God, even if he be not a philosopher, the rule will seem rational and not impossible to follow. Philo-

sophers like Marcus Aurelius have also said that one ought to stand firm in pain and sorrow and death, when he is convinced of the reign of law in the universe. But the rule of Manu is more spiritual and more in accordance with modern science. All progress in life is attained through labour and pain, which are the Tapas leading to the good. The progress of all life through pain is a fact vouched for by science and is not mere philosophic speculation or religious revelation. But the question is whether the individual suffering the pains will be participant in the progress of the species, in the evolution of the spiritual in life, after the dissolution of his body. There is every reason for the belief that the individual is not lost but even if he be, the rule of Manu is noble and rational for man to follow.

The ideal has been defined. Every effort should be made for its attainment. This is the object of life, which is intended to be a thing of continuous and never-failing joy to one's self and to one's fellow-beings. The impossible idea of destroying desire and the senses leads to nothingness, Nirvana or Moksha or Heaven, by whatever name you call it. Culture of the body and the mind and of the spirit, the seeking of freedom of thought and action for one's self and for one's fellow-mortals, the attainment of the highest knowledge, the keenest and the highest pleasures of sense and mind and spirit, the purest goodness for one's self and for others is the object. What are the means of its attainment ?

The boy should be trained in body and mind. Education should be made pleasant and acquisition

Training of
youth.

*
High voca-
tion of tea-
chers.

of knowledge a source of joy, as it undoubtedly is. The eye and the ear should be trained together with the hand. Above all, the boy should be made to acquire the habit of strenuous labour and discipline. Fear and nervousness should be abolished from the kingdom of boys. They should be taught that riches, high places and material pleasures are not of much worth. They should be early taught truth and purity and kindness to all beings. Every boy should be taught the habit of worship early. It is useless to pray at old age or at death bed with fear and trembling. The acquisition of habits, which lead to progress, is the object of the training of youth by compulsion and inducement. There must be compulsion in the case of boys. It is possible to train the boys and girls of a people but difficult to put grown-up men under training. This should be understood by the rulers of men and moralists. The education of youth is the most important work of the state and the educationist is the most potent factor in the progress of man. The ideal should first be defined and the educationist asked to train the boys and the girls so that they may attain it. If the ideal is known, the educationist will find out the methods of training. The teacher should however be one who would be above the modern general love of wealth and pleasure and admiration of the wicked great and the wealthy and contempt for undistinguished goodness.

Not only the individual but the aggregate of human kind must be taken care of and their pro-

gress and happiness secured. It should not be forgotten that the individual can rarely, if ever, outgrow his environment. The happiness and progress of the many are therefore more important than those of the individual and to that end the individual must sacrifice himself.

Happiness
and progress
of the many.

There should be teachers for the development of the mind and the ethical instinct and also for the body of all members of the society and state. They should be supported by the state.

There should also be a body of men whose main vocation in life would be religious instruction and affording religious comfort to men. They should be highly educated men who would dedicate their powers to the service of the Lord and whose mission would be to strengthen the beliefs of men in a loving Father and to make them stand firm in that belief, in sorrow and death. They should not be priests for helping the State by praying for the destruction of its enemies. They should be true priests of the Lord, sky-pilots, for poor men.

Necessity
priests.

There is one matter, which requires more careful consideration than I have given to it in the preceding pages and that is, is progress compatible with dependence on God, which belief in Him induces? It is clear that earnest endeavour is the cause of all progress. The highest good is attained by it when it is directed in the right path. We work in spite of ourselves, for nature will not stand still. Conscious strenuous effort of the freeman is the crown of life, nobler than the crowns of kings and the

Is progress
compatible
with depen-
dence on
God?

plumed caps of the great. The teachers of those systems, which ignore God and salvation without effort, are in this respect right. The followers of the great systems of Buddhism, Positivism and Materialism, which inculcate freedom of thought and action will surely, find fault with me, because I maintain that a lovable and loving God is necessary for the realization of the highest ideal of existence. I may be considered still in the meshes of Brahman. But I have shown that there is nothing in my position which is inconsistent with their highest good. No fear and no fetters and no dependence that kills the spirit have any place in positive religion. The present-day Christian and the theist are inclined to distrust human effort, reliance on self and freedom, as leading to the fate of Lucifer. It is the rock of pride surely on which Lucifer, the morning star of the angels of God, was wrecked and it was for this that Vritra, the great Asura of the Aryans, fell and Bali, the mightiest and noblest of the kings of demons, was sent to the nether-world according to Hindu mythology. It was for this that Prometheus came to grief. Are freedom and self-reliance pride? Is strenuous effort pride? Pride is the desire to place one's self above others, to make others bow to you: indeed it is the desire to be master of your fellow-beings. It is this desire, which is the most ignoble of all desires, though glorified by historians. It has no place in my position and is wholly inconsistent with it. The mind, which delights in the defeat and pain of others, is not desirable nor noble according to the positive ideal: it is after all the

mind of the boy, who delights in giving pain to little things like ants.

I consider the fear of God, which is impossible by the character of the utterly loving one, as not desirable and the fear of hell-fire as utterly ignoble and conducive to the misery of the many, and progress by favour without effort is neither possible nor good. Not righteousness but grace saves, it is said. Surely righteousness saves, but is not righteousness grace? After all, does not everything, that we possess, proceed from grace? The eye sees. What has provided for it the glorious sights of the earth and of the heavens? The eye sees, it becomes finer and perceives forms more and more beautiful and spiritual with its development and goes forward to the achievement of the happiness of seeing the utterly beautiful One. This glorious result is caused by the strenuous effort of the poor pitiful mortal being, called man, who again, science tells us, has been evolved, in the struggle in which the fittest survive, out of forms of life in which the eye was merely a spot on the head. The irritation caused by light on the optical nerve might have produced the undeveloped eye. But the fine sense, which man possesses, has been evolved by much effort, the keenest of struggles and the most poignant of pains. Is not this effort the result of grace? Is not the evolution of higher forms and the unfolding of the petals of the rose of existence a manifestation of Grace abounding? The ear hears more enchanting sounds with its growth, and expects to hear the utterly sweet voice of the Source of all

music. The mind grows and the spirit developes in pain and labour, and surely man, indeed each one of us, may expect to feel the touch of the Most High on his shoulders and to hear the music of His voice calling him "O, man greatly beloved!" It is the highest grace. All the forces of nature and all the effort of living beings can not be conceived of themselves solely as producing the above marvellous results. Grace will make you work in spite of yourself. But without your own effort there is no progress and no salvation. Salvation without effort is an ignoble and mischievous idea and unwarranted by the laws of nature.

If one believes in God, as the most lovable and loving of all, he will surely run to meet Him and never tarry. As the hart panteth for the water-brooks so does the soul pant for God and run to meet Him. Strenuous endeavour is the only sign of the apprehension of Grace.

As I have said before, only a daub pleases a savage; a Raphael's picture or Beethoven's music can have no meaning or pleasure for him; they will not attract his eye and his ear. Kindness and mercy have no beauty for him. Go further and you will find that God is not perceived, notwithstanding the fact that He is always before our eyes, because we have not advanced far enough. The savage man worships stones and trees, ghosts and hobgoblins, the sun and the moon, and as he advances further, he worships the anthropomorphic gods or divine men or incarnations of god. He goes further and fancies God to be so high as to be either practically

non-existent for man or requiring an intermediate being as a link connecting Him with man, who some suppose, averts God's wrath against men by taking it upon himself. With the progress of man his idea of God will advance still further. It is clear that the refining and the spiritualizing of man with his body, mind and soul can alone bring him a better apprehension and a nearer and clearer vision of God. This requires endeavour. Endeavour of the individual is the law by which higher species is evolved and, with it, the ideas of God and better apprehension of Him. The power and the opportunity for endeavour and the certainty of progress leading to the delectable mountains, of a certainty however, proceed from Grace abounding.

Let us consider the matter further. The eye sees, the ear hears, the heart throbs, not of their own force. The eye is dependent for its very existence on light. The modern scientist says that it is the result of the irritation caused by light on the optic gland. But that irritation to be effective must be felt by a sentient being. The Buddhist says that is true and affirms that everything comes into existence from desire in living beings. But the whole fabric of existence could not come out of the will or desire of man, as the great Buddha thought or as the great modern pantheists think. Their doctrine, if true, would lead to the inexorable logical conclusion of the Buddhists that extinction is the only desirable end of life. The will and the desire are the results of existence. They are always found, it is true, together with life but

surely the idea of existence precedes that of desire. Desire cannot be the primal cause of existence. Dependence is the very root of existence. Every man and beast feels it. The confirmed pantheist or deist feels it, however lightly he may speak of his independence and of his godhood or of a God who has no concern with his life. He can free himself of it only by extinguishing existence, as Buddha truly said. But we are not considering the extinguishment of existence but its ideal. Man knows that a thorn or a worm or a few minute bacteria may put an end to his life and his labours. He did not himself bring his being into existence. He can to a certain degree command the forces of nature. Still he is of a certainty not independent of them. Every seeing, truthful man therefore throws himself on the lotus feet, as the Hindu would say, of the Source of all things and attains the rest, which is otherwise unattainable. Man certainly does depend upon Him, Who is the source and base of his life. But it is said that the species advances at the expense of the individual in nature. Where then is the God of the individual? God helps the species and also the individual. The earnest soul by habit of worship and prayer and constant feeling of dependence on Him has often the consciousness of the hand of the eternal loving Father resting on his head. It is by love to Him and the feeling of dependence on Him that we can have perception of His helping the individual. The individual is not friendless, helpless and hopeless during his existence. Worship, prayer and dependence on God are therefore

Work therefore without ceasing, suffer without complaining, develop all your faculties and power, make the good of others of more moment to yourself than your material good, and worship and renew your strength from the original source of all strength. You should not flag in your efforts, believing that you are immortal. Your descendants in consequence of your efforts are sure to be better and happier than yourself in any event. Even you, it is possible may attain to a higher state. Remember that from dead or all-but-dead matter by an inscrutable Power all your faculties have been evolved through the infinite grades of life. The higher you grow, the more conscious you are of the fetters that bind you to dead matter. You find them to be distressing and wish you are unfeeling matter again. But you should not forget the natural course of life; you have to experience pain, to pass through the shadows of death. Consider the course of evolution of life in the lower grades and how the higher, nobler and more enjoyable life has been in the past evolved through the free effort of the living being and the help of the Lord of all life and progress. You have every reason to hope.

Forward soldier of God, in the high endeavour attain the good. Are you tired with your load and distressed for want of love? Go on, you who are yearning after the utterly lovable and loving one. He is by your side and you will some day see Him face to face and rest your weary head on His bosom.

CHAPTER XIII

WOMAN AND POSITIVE RELIGION.

Position of
man.

Woman, in her relation to man, as mother, wife, daughter, sister, nurse and friend, has been given a place very like to that of God in some modern systems of social religion called positive. But the position is one for people only to admire at ; there is nothing practical or positive or true that is intended. History tells as a very different story about the position, which man has hitherto accorded to woman. Woman, because of the weakness of her body and dependence on man for the support of her ownself and of her child during the period of maternity and some time after, has been obliged to take the position of a slave. Women were often captured in ancient times for marriage. They were considered as chattels belonging to a man. The sale of girls in Babylon in the marriage market was not peculiar to that country. The father or any other master of a girl always took a price from the person wishing to marry her, in all countries. The wives of a warrior, his horse and some slaves were burnt or buried with him. The law of the slave applied to the woman and, like the allegiance of the slave, her loyalty to her master was enforced by law. This loyalty was called chastity and the woman who was burnt on the funeral pyre of her dead husband was glorified as a saint or a goddess. But there was no corresponding loyalty obligatory on her master, the man.

I have shown before that the poor labouring classes, among whom men and women have to mix promiscuously with one another in working for their bread, who are themselves all but slaves and can not keep slaves, in a seraglio or harem, cannot be so very punctilious. A text of an ancient law book of the Hindus says that Sudras, i. e. the classes subject to the few ruling castes, can have no marriage or chastity or legitimate children. The higher castes and the nobles of Europe and India had the right to enjoy the wives of their serfs and such right was allowed by Hindu and Christian religious men. This was the old state of things and the National Convention of France was justified in abolishing this false chastity together with the god of terror who condemned women disobedient to their master to eternal hellfire. The old laws about chastity embody the custom of strong men enforcing obedience on their women, and slaves, the infringement of which priests employed by them put in their revealed books as a grave crime and an inexpressible sin. Chastity has hitherto only meant loyalty to a man of a woman, who on account of her weakness and helplessness is obliged to take the position of a slave, and it has been practically the great peculiar virtue confined to the higher, or rather, the leisured ruling castes. But from this custom of the rich slavemaster, a noble ideal is being evolved.

Let there be no mistake. The true idea of chastity is a reality of life and not a mere convention. The family and home are dependent on chastity. It is the privilege of man to found a home, on which

all noble virtues are based. Chastity is thus the peculiar privilege of the moral and honourable being called man who founds a family.

It is one of the basic principles of life but its true meaning must not be misinterpreted to the undoing of the mothers and daughters of men. Chastity is synonymous with the deepest affection, truest loyalty, finest honour and the most absolute self-restraint and self-sacrifice, which are developed in the hearts of men and women out of the predominant instinct of living beings, which gives birth to children and brings them up and trains them to higher life. It should not be mistaken for the enforced loyalty of the slave-woman, the one-sided chastity, from which has proceeded the oppressions and murders of women. Nor should it be mistaken for the poetic sentimentality, with which the sexual attraction is cloaked and which is called 'sovrän love' and the like, by poets and writers, which leads to unbridled self-indulgence and which is incompatible with the noble life, of which control of the senses and self-sacrifice are the essence. Such chastity is incompatible with true motherhood, with true fatherhood, with true sonship and with true brotherhood. The pure and beautiful flower of chastity watered by the springs of love has not yet expanded to its full glory. Like all other virtues, it is growing and the mind can have only a faint idea of the beautiful tints it will evolve in future.

As a logical consequence of the old, idea, founded on the lust of the strong man, of the animal in

man, the relation between man and woman was considered impure till recent times. This led to the belief that a man having any connection with a woman could not be a saint or go to the highest heaven. Even Jesus preferred those who were eunuchs for the sake of the kingdom of heaven. Christian monks, Buddhist Bhikkus and Hindu Sanyasis all teach the innate impurity of sex and its incompatibility with the highest religion, i. e. with the really religious life. Poor woman ! thou hast been impure and a clog, thou art the temptress who tempted thy master from the garden of Eden !

The whole world of living beings depends on the sexual relation. Wifehood and motherhood are conditions nobler than any other. Celibate saints may be good and holy but they have no part in this world of throbbing life. They belong to the high windless regions, which they call heaven, where there is no sex, no feeling and no life.

There have been a class of men, who have gone to the extreme of holding that sexual intercourse is a part of religious exercise. This cult was very prevalent in all countries in ancient times and still persists in India and in northern and central Asia. The impure and false ideas underlying this unholy cult have deservedly fallen into disrepute.

Positive religion is evolved out of the joys, sorrows, pains and struggles of living beings. Fatherhood and motherhood, sonship and brotherhood, friendship, mercy and love, control of the senses and self-sacrifice, out of which grow the worship and love of

the living God, all these are concentrated in the loyal and honourable relationship of man and woman. The Tantrikas of India and eastern Asia only dimly appreciated the significance of this relationship and degraded the true cult into their immoral obscene practices. But there certainly is a deep religious significance to this pure relationship, which is the foundation of this world of life. The chaste and pure love of the father and the mother runs through the lowest and highest grades of life and ends in God, Who is father and mother, son and brother, friend and lover of all life. It is in Him that the supreme flower of love, of which the above are the many tinted petals, blossoms in its perfection and glory. The true spiritual and religious significance of this relationship of man and woman will be apparent in time.

The relationship of husband and wife, though it originated in lust, should be based on love. But love is fickle, more fickle in beast and bird than in man. The family and home are founded not only on love but on the occult law in nature, which makes helplessness extort help from outside, that eternal law of mercy out of which love has proceeded. This great law the modern exponents of evolution have confessed their inability to explain but have recognized as by it the world of life is sustained and the parents protect and support their young ones while they are helpless and only so long as they are helpless.

All ethics and all sentiments of love and mercy begin when the overmastering reproductive instinct

in life brings together the male and the female. Society with all the potentialities of ethics begins there. But the self-disregarding love begins only when the offspring is born. Then the maternal instinct manifests itself. This maternal instinct, while the young ones are helpless, is stronger than the most potent instinct of life, namely, the instinct of self-preservation. In the lower organisms, as soon as the young ones are able to take care of themselves, the mother loses all her love for them. Who can explain this law? Clearly the helplessness of the young ones is the determining element in this phenomenon. It is an ethical and spiritual element in life, for matter and nature do not care for the weak and the helpless but delight in destroying them. The mother animal seems for a short time possessed by a Spirit, ethical and merciful, which is a stranger to her nature, for the protection of the helpless. Some Power takes care of the poor and the helpless, for the preservation of life, against nature, which by its constitution crushes to death the weak. But you may say that that power is often impotent to save all. We do not presume to know the nature of that power. All that we find is that it manifests itself first in nature in the short-lived maternal instinct. Whether it always takes care of the weak and helpless we do not yet positively know. But this maternal instinct and the inclination in living beings to help the helpless show that it is working in nature. It is outside nature and the material constitution of living organisms. It appears often as being impotent to save and frequently cannot be found even attempting to help.

Society,
ethics, love
and self-sacrifice
depend on
sexual relation

But there is such a power. Time may come when the spiritualized vision and reason of man will find that it is never absent and that, if it fails to save, it is not because of its impotence.

However, that may be, love is first felt in the heart of the mother. It is ephemeral in the lower organisms. It becomes more lasting in the higher organisms. Will it lead to eternal love in the process of evolution? In the lower organisms, the father takes no care of the children. Even in comparatively higher organisms like the cats and the monkeys, when nature does not require the help of the male for the preservation of the offspring, the male parents are absolutely indifferent and are even anxious to kill the offspring, and the mother conceals them from the merciless father. But when the mother becomes helpless in maternity, in the higher organisms, the power that saves the helpless, possesses the father who becomes mother and father to both the helpless mother and the offspring. That is however only for the period of their helplessness. The father becomes absolutely indifferent thereafter and would fight his grown-up male offspring and try to destroy them. With the higher organisms the period of helplessness of the young becomes increasingly greater and the parental instinct longer-lived. By habit it outlives the natural period lasting during helplessness, in the case of man. Again the higher reason of man shows both to the father and the son the necessity of keeping together till death for mutual protection. Thus is lasting love produced. In the case of the woman also, it is the growing reason of man which makes the man and her

female mate stick together with their children till death. From the family, all affections proceed. They are all in their nature self-disregarding, though ephemeral, as in the case of the maternal instinct.

All ethics, all mercy, as we have seen above, and all love proceed from the sexual relation. The mother is more important in the lower organism than the father. This is the position of the woman in ethics and religion. She is the original receptacle of the "influx" of love from some power anxious to save the helpless. Father and mother are necessary for the preservation of the universe of life. The mother first and the father next are inspired by self-disregarding love from a strange power outside matter and nature, which are wholly unethical. The spirit of ethics and self-disregarding love works through them and thus this relationship is glorified. How has this pure spirituality of the relationship been corrupted by vicious material ideas ! Through wife and mother, husband and father, as receptacles of it, the spirit of goodness, mercy and love first manifested itself and asserted its predominance over unethical, cruel, relentless nature. Let not the sacred vessel be desecrated by unholy ideas. Let not woman be degraded.

Woman as
receptacle of
influx of di-
vine of love.

Woman should be given equal instruction and equal facilities for developing the body as man, and equal freedom and also equal opportunities of pleasure and of work. She will in time approximate man in her intellectual powers. She should however be protected by man and the state and enabled to fulfil her paramount duty of motherhood, and she on her

part should not forget that upon her depends the family and the state and all civilization and progress.

Her mission
of sacrifice.

Woman is and shall always remain the first receptacle of the influx of ethical force from the great Power that takes care of the helpless and she will be more cared for by that Power than man. The love of woman is literally the love of God at the period of the helplessness of childhood to every being. Woman again represents the principle in life which takes care of the individual in preference to the species. Her mission is great. Her life comes to an end in the case of some lower organisms when the young become strong enough by the food supplied by her own body. She is the victim required by nature for the preservation of life. But with the evolution of the higher forms of life, the sacrifice required of her is becoming less and less. But the habit of sacrifice imposed on her by nature must produce a higher spirituality in her. All this will be made clear as greater spirituality is evolved among man.

In the meantime, let woman be cared for and trained equally with man, as far as possible. Let society take care that ignoble men do not use her like a chattel or a slave and take advantage of the weakness, which is imposed on her for rearing up men, her children. Slaves have been emancipated. The emancipation of women has to some extent been effected among advance nations. Among the less advance nations, she is still no better than a slave and a chattel. Fortunately by a mysterious law of nature, the man of these races are

themselves slaves of the other advanced races. Freedom of men, as well as of women, goes with the progress of the race. The time is surely coming when woman will attain complete freedom and equality with man, consistent with her high peculiar mission of self-sacrifice for the race. Let woman be cared for and honoured. The contrary conduct by an inexorable spiritual law leads to ruin.

Woman has in consequence of her position of servitude developed certain traits of character which are highly prized by religious men. In all countries, all religious rituals and ceremonies are observed mostly by women. If they did not exist, churches, temples and places of pilgrimage would be practically deserted and priests, Christian and Buddhist, and especially Brahmins, would find their occupations gone. It is therefore declared by the priests that women are more religious than men. They are helpless at the hands of their husbands and their life is one of continuous household toil and anxiety for their children. Naturally, observance of religious ceremonies, which are in reality unmeaning superstitions but which they accept as efficacious on account of the habit of obedience to authority and custom acquired by them, becomes one of the principal occupations of their lives. Priests and philosophers therefore declare that they are religious, but at the same time they lay down in their scriptures that woman is immoral by instinct and has no soul and that she should be kept ignorant and should never learn the true lessons of religion. There is some

Advantageous position of woman in religion.

truth in this religious canon. Woman develops all the vices and wiles, which slaves and helpless oppressed persons acquire from long subjection. Slaves are naturally deceitful, immoral, subservient, hypocritical and cruel. If woman has not acquired all the defects of the slave, it is on account of the inherent nobility of motherhood which nature has dowered her with. But until her position of servitude and ignorance, is destroyed and until she is given a position of equality as regards knowledge, property and religious exercises, with man, she cannot make the progress of which she is capable. Slowly, civilized man is waking to a consciousness of the fact. When woman will be as advanced in knowledge and freedom as man, the advancement of mankind will be greatly more rapid than it is at present.

The passive nature of woman's character, her habit of obedience, and her continued observance of religious ceremonies, fasts, bathings and pilgrimages have however given her an advantage over man. She is more amenable to outside spiritual influence than man. The very first experience of the love, which is inexplicable by any law of nature, which a living being gets, is through her. She is the receptacle and the medium of the manifestation of the first miracle in life, which preserves. Her sense-perceptions are more easily developed, and telepathy, clairaudience clairvoyance and the like powers are more natural to her than to man, because of her weakness and because of her peculiar nervous condition. She is, on account of her mother-duties, the helpless member of

the household of God and is by the ethical law more cared for by the great Power than man. Woman has been the medium through which the universe of life has learnt the first lessons of love and the supreme virtue of self-sacrifice. Through her co-operation with man, the spirit is being slowly evolved. Through her, the miracles of the manifestation of divine love occur in life and will be more frequently perceived in future. The weak and the helpless have their uses in the evolution of the spirit. Woman's life is noble and it will be nobler and nobler, as she advances in knowledge and independence. Her part in the evolution of the spirit may be greater than that of man. No system of religion is of any worth which ignores the nobility that is hers and the part which she plays in bringing about the highest in life.

CHAPTER XIV.

RELIGION AND COMMON LIFE.

Ruling class
and religion.

We find in books, prose and poetry, only accounts of the lives of the leisured people who have not to struggle for their bread. It is a fact of history that in ancient times true religion was considered as fit only for the ruling classes and privileged castes. This followed from the fact of conquest and reduction to slavery of weaker races by stronger ones. The lower classes representing the conquered race were not allowed to have any participation in the religion of the conquerors, as we find enjoined in *Manu* and the *Old Testament*, and the gods of the conquerors, who were supposed to prevail over the impotent gods of the conquered, could not be the gods of the latter. For the common people a lower code of morality and a lower religion, which required all religious acts to be performed through priests employed by the ruling classes, were enjoined. Since the French Revolution the common people have asserted their strength and manhood. The gods, the priests and the religion which was peculiar to the ruling classes and which was enforced on the common people have been crumbling away. Together with the disgustingly oppressive privileges enjoyed by the feudal lords, the God worshipped by them and their priests were rejected by the common people of France. But the true God cannot be discarded. A truer conception of a just and good

God and a higher religion, in which the common man has his part and which regards all men and women as equal, are slowly evolving.

The ideal of the leisured cultured classes is the ideal of human life. But nevertheless there is dignity in the common life, in the life of the man and the woman who labour with their hands in order to be able to keep body and soul together. They are considered as unclean, ignoble and immoral by those comfortable people, who earn large incomes by teaching, law, clerical service, priestly office, trade, commerce and other superior callings, by those few men who constitute the middle and the wealthy classes and who call themselves gentlemen and noblemen. The man working in a coal mine, whose body is blackened with coal dust, or the cultivator, whose skin is tanned by the sun and whose hands and feet are large, hard and uncouth, these common men and women, who live in mean dwelling houses, who can not change or wash their clothes as frequently as their more fortunate brethren, are surely dirty and unclean. They have their loves, which are stronger than the loves of the comfortable ones but they can indulge in no sentimental rhapsodies. Their virtue is stronger and truer than the virtue of the ruling classes. Indeed history tells us that rules of morality were made by nobles and priests to keep the lower classes in order and not for themselves. They had another code for themselves. Thus by habit the common men became moral, and from them the higher castes have learnt the lesson that morality was binding on all men.

The religious man, priest or devotee, who has not to think of his daily bread, kneels or sits cross-legged with closed eyes and spends his life in indulging in fancies and meditations about the next world and in giving doles of charity out of his abundance to the poor in pity. He is indeed fortunate, but let him consider seriously whether he is serving God better than the common labouring man. The poor labourer has no time to sit in meditation and can not give in charity out of his abundance. The unceasing labour, the wants of his children, their sickness and death from want of common comforts and medical help leave no room in his anxious and overwrought mind for higher meditations or sentimental morality. But surely the rich and the pious are greatly mistaken, if they think that they serve God better. The poor alone know how to call on the Lord. The Lord is concerned only with His poor ones. The rich and the comfortable surely have had their reward. The poor only fulfil by their life-and-death struggle God's purpose of bringing out the higher life, which is very different from leisured cultured meditation and sentimentality. Science and art, poetry and philosophy, chastity and religion are noble products of human endeavour. They are now the property of the leisured classes. It is hoped that they will soon be the property of the majority of mankind. They ennoble the human soul. But it is the struggles of the poor that will ultimately evolve the higher life.

It was the struggles of the poor for their very existence that brought into existence the rudiments of

science and of art. They have been developed by the earnest endeavour of needy persons, who to some extent were favoured by fortune with leisure and want of care. There is no difference in the bodies of the ignorant and of the learned. There is also not much difference, if any, in the real qualities of their minds and souls. There is probably more malice, more lust, more impurity, more dishonesty in the minds of the rich and the great than in the poor and the lowly. A man in want of bread steals. Another man, learned and influential, in order to satisfy his selfish desires, prompted by vanity and not by want, gets money by dishonest means. The common thief has much excuse and he will be judged accordingly. The learned and rich unscrupulous person has no excuse and a just judge will not overlook his crime. A poor woman earning her bread with difficulty among men falls a victim to temptation, want and opportunity. She may be pure in the eyes of the merciful and all-knowing Judge. But a cultured woman having no want, reading much poetry and romance, considers love-making as the sole object of her life and willingly falls and her escapade is called romance by persons of the leisured classes. Her conduct may not be as leniently regarded by the Judge as that of her poorer sister. Among the leisured classes, common sexual desire prompted by the instinct of propagation of the species is glorified into Love Everlasting. The poor can have no such sentimental and happy delusions. But take the measure of the soul of a poor man or woman and also that of their more fortunate, educated philosophic and artistic brother or sister, there is in

The struggles of poor and nobler life.

reality not much material difference and sometimes whatever little difference there is, it is in favour of the poor and the unfortunate. What idea can the rich and the leisured person, without want, have of the real life of man. Those that have been always at ease cannot even imagine the real and natural motives of human action.

A poor man, who with difficulty earns his bread by hard manual labour from morning till evening, comes home at night to find his little ones sick unto death. He cannot provide the ordinary comforts for the sick and can with difficulty have a doctor or medicine. This poor man himself falls ill and can not work and sees his wife and children starve. Can his more fortunate brother imagine the frame of mind of such a person? The children of the poor have to work for their bread, as soon as they can walk, while the children of the comfortable classes are fondled, sent to school and given sweets and beautiful toys to play with. Are you sure in the economy of God's universe there is no recompense for the children of the poor? There are two classes : those that have not to struggle for their daily bread and those that have to do so. The former are few in number. The latter are the many. They are the mankind. Christ was a poor carpenter's son. He lived among and for the poor. The Lord's prayer was for them and not for the comfortable classes. Those two classes have little in common. Those that are not in want are like the beautiful singing birds, the pets

of the fickle beautiful woman called Fortune. They cannot evolve the higher species. A higher species will surely be evolved out of mankind, but the result will be achieved by the struggle for existence of mankind, in which the rich can have little part. The leisured man who is not in want of his daily bread, can call a million times on God and go through numerous purificatory ceremonies and employ his time in devotional exercises and meditations. The poor man after a day of hard labour, probably buffeted and insulted during the day by the stronger or richer brother, comes home to find his children sick and without comfort. He is ignorant and his home is ill-lighted and the terror of ghosts and evil spirits oppresses him. He alone knows the sorrows and anxieties and terrors of life and becomes stronger and stronger in consequence. The devout philosopher looks down upon this man and with the Hindu wisely says that his miserable condition is the result of his misdeeds in a past existence or in early life. The fortunate ones of this earth may delude themselves into the belief that they alone will go to heaven but let them not imagine for a moment that God has less regard for His poor despised children than for themselves. The daily labour of the poor is sanctified service. Their cry of pain reaches the throne of the Father without doubt. The hypocritical prayers of the comfortable are surely of no consequence in comparison. The merciful Lord, Who, out of the struggle for existence of living cells, has evolved the noble species man, regards with love all struggles of His children for their existence, out of which a nobler species, He, the

great Architect, is evolving. Those struggles alone are of moment in this world of life, and God surely loves His struggling children whom He clothes with nobler robes, with nobler senses and with nobler lives. Out of his infinite mercy, He has ordained that His children will be co-workers with Him in working out, nobler lives for themselves.

The common despised man, humble and sinning, despised by the world, has a further great advantage. It is not only the noble man that yearns for justice that he never gets from his fellow-men, but it is the lowly and the bad men, who feel the need of a just God more acutely and in a much greater measure than the high-placed, the good and the noble-minded, for the judgment passed by the world on their failure has damned them and they feel that the judgment is not quite just and look to God as their court of appeal. "To our own consciousness there is usually a residuum of worth left over after our sins and errors have been told off; our capacity of acknowledging and regretting them is the germ of a better self *in posse* at least. But the world deals with us *in actu* and not *in posse* and of this hidden germ, not to be guessed at from without, it never takes account. Then we turn to the All-knower, Who knows our bad, but Who knows this good in us also and Who is just; we cast ourselves with our repentance on His mercy. Only by an All-knower can we finally be judged. So the need of a God very definitely emerges from this experience of life."* Thus to the lowly common man

* Varieties of Religious Experience.

the need for God is more manifest than to the great, the fortunate and the honoured ones of the earth. "God", rightly said Luther, "is the God of the humble, the miserable, the oppressed and the desperate and of those that are brought to nothing; and His nature is to give sight to the blind, to comfort the broken-hearted, to justify sinners, to save the very desperate and damned."

The leisured classes are necessary for the progress of man. Science and art, philosophy and religious ideas are developed by leisure. But these are necessary only in so far as they are instrumental in evolving the higher life. So far as they effect that object they are useful. They were of little use to many great men, for they did not lead to noble or pure life. In as much as they bring into existence higher ideas of beauty, knowledge, purity, love and spirituality, they are necessary. They are surely of supreme importance in the economy of nature. But nevertheless it is the common life through which they fructify. Could that dream in marble, the Taj Mahal of Delhi, be built, except by the sweat of the brow of the common labouring man? Who built the noble cathedrals and palaces of Europe? Could the engines, the mills and the factories of the world be built and worked, except by the common men? Who made the telescopes, the microscopes and other scientific instruments? They all have been made by the sweat of the brow of the poor working man, though he worked under the orders of his more cultured brother. There was a time when the common artisan, the mason, the carpenter and the iron-smith

Necessity of
leisured
classes.

worked for himself without the guidance of his superiors. Even the painter, the singer, the dancer and the actor, aye, even the lawyer, the physician and the surgeon, belonged to the low despised classes. All arts and crafts still depend mainly on the labour of the poor working man, but their progress and development now require highly specialized educated engineers and the like to captain them. But let it not be forgotten that originally all the engineers rose and even now many rise from the ranks of the labouring classes. Even now the engineers and the trading classes are considered lower than the lawyers, the military officers and the politicians who feed upon them and rule over them. All that is noble in architecture, science, music, painting, and all arts and crafts have been made by the poor working man. All that is truly noble in this world of ours is the handiwork of the poor labourer. The only life that is noble is thus the common life of the poor working man, despised though he has always been by the men with the strong limbs, the oppressors of the poor, who constituted themselves nobles and priests and learned men—the Kshatriyas or the warrior caste and the Brahmins or the priests and learned men of the ancient Aryans. But surely the common life is the only life that is regarded by Providence as of supreme importance in the progress of living beings. Let no one think low of his own life of pain and drudgery, let not the proud noble or priest or philosopher despise him or think that he is of more moment to the Great Architect than his humbler brother.

When we read the accounts of the private lives of Napoleons, Nelsons, Byrons, Bacons, Goethes, Titians, Dantes, Schopenhauers and other great men, do we find that they were in their conduct nobler than their common fellow-men? They did great work but that work was for the benefit and progress of the poor and the lowly and so far as their works leavened the masses and raised the general standard of culture, they were useful. The poor struggling man is of the house-hold of the merciful Lord. Let him not doubt it. The nobler life that shall be evolved in future will be from his life as affected by the work of the more fortunate philosophers, poets scientists and religious men. The time will surely come when the poor struggling man will see more beauty in nature than the more fortunate artist who imparts the idea to him, when he will practise greater and truer charity, benevolence and chastity than his more fortunate brother, when the significance of life will be clearer to him than to the idle rich, and when he will find that his agonized cry is true prayer to the living God and that it is heard. The rich, the learned, the philosophic and the religious shall always enjoy the esteem and honour of mankind and shall have their reward. But the life of the poor, though unregarded by them, shall be always regarded by the Father as truly noble and of more moment.

What is the course of events we find in nature? The survival of the fittest, the elimination of the weaker by the stronger races, the relentless oppression of the weak by the strong; these are facts of na-

ture. Philosophers infer from them that there is no God. Physical strength and spiritually go together up to a certain stage in the evolution of life. Up to that stage the weak must go down before the strong. But beyond that stage the spirit begins to assert its power over physical force. Then the children of the strong and the immoral pass away before the children of the seemingly weak. The process that has been going on among men exemplifies the fact. The strong men became feudal lords enslaving the weaker people under them. They had all the advantages of education, art, science, philosophy and religion. They advanced the higher pursuits of man. But notwithstanding all these advantages, their class became physically, intellectually and morally degenerated. The hard life of their retainers, the slaves, had its advantage. It produced a hardier, tougher race than that of their masters. Their masters monopolized learning, made religion and morality their special province; and the priests, who in India and in Europe were wholly recruited from the class, who called themselves gentlemen, made religion and morality the means by which to impress the inferiority of the masses upon their minds and to add the slavery of the mind to the slavery of the body. The feudal lords and the higher castes enforced chastity among their own women even to the extent of prescribing the burning of widows with their male masters, but they considered the chastity of the women of the lower classes as of no moment and by custom they could enjoy the maidens and married women of their slaves, the lower castes, without blame. So the poor

lower classes could not have even the fine idea of chastity of their masters or of the everlasting love, of which their poets sang so rapturously. But the life of the strong slave-driver was false and impure, notwithstanding his culture and education.* Tolstoy's works have abundantly shown "the ignobility of fashionable life, the infamies of empire, the spuriousness of the church, the vain conceit of the professions, the meannesses and cruelties that go with great success and the hollowness of every other pompous crime and lying institution of the world".* The life of the lower working classes was truer and purer. They only understood the true significance of misery and benevolence, of love and true chastity. They alone in their agony had glimpses of the true God. The natural result followed : the higher classes became degenerate and passed away, when they had served the purpose of imparting the knowledge and the noble ideas, which their leisure enabled them to acquire, to the masses. From among the masses, is also arising a class, the employers of labour, who are a class much larger in number than the old feudal lords and the Brahmins and the Syeds, who by their superior strength are now dominating and will for a time dominate the weaker classes. In course of time the children of the same weaker classes will again supplant the new stronger classes. Thus the process of evolution will go on. The true life that is in man requires the struggle for existence consequent on the oppression

* Poor Romanoffs, masters of half the globe they have passed into the ranks of common men so soon after Tolstoy's death. See *Varieties of Religions Exercise* p. 188.

of the weak by the strong. The strong prevail for a time. The weak are often exterminated. But ultimately the children of the strong degenerate physically, intellectually and morally, because of their tyrannical and unjust and artificial life of leisure which leads to idleness, pride, indifference and false sentimentality, serving however the high purpose of improving the masses. The strong races pass away unblessed and unwept. The children of the weak schooled in adversity and hardship, blossom forth into a higher race, the oppressors of their fathers having been in reality their servants, the chief object of whose existence was to make the children of the oppressed stronger, better, truer and nobler than their own children. Many are the weak races that have been exterminated by their stronger and merciless oppressors. But the higher classes that dominate their own race in the act of the extermination of their weaker neighbours, pay the penalty of their wickedness. Their children also pass away as surely as the oppressed. Again, by what strange law is it that the children of the strong, indeed even of the great men of genius also, degenerate into common weak men? The strong and the great only serve the purpose of the race of common men and pass away.

Some modern European philosophers are great believers in the law of might and force. Neitzche writes : " Not contentment but more power, not peace but war, not virtue but valour," are of moment. " The weak and helpless must go to the wall and we shall help them to go. Weakness is more harmful than any

vice. We can have only pity for the weak and the helpless." These philosophers further say : " We have heard how in old times it was said "blessed are the meek for they shall inherit the earth ; " but I say unto you, "bleassed are the valiant for they shall make the earth their throne." And ye have heard say "blessed are the poor in spirit ; but I say unto you, blessed are the great is soul and the free in spirit for they shall enter into Valhalla." He consigns the masses of the race "to the devil and statistics as blurred copies on bad paper and from worn out plates." English writers laugh at Nietzsche but at bottom their philosophers are no better. Pattison says: "Mankind it has been finely said is' "all mass to the human eye and all individual to the divine " (Mozleys' University Sermons). It not to Nietzsche's diseased extent we are all prone to the same feeling." Men and peoples, who make others weaker than they their slaves, raise their hands in horror when men stronger than they, justify their action by referring to the primal laws of nature embodied in the above philosophy, which alone, according to them, lead to progress and virtue. But over and beyond those laws is the law that the weak ones are not helpless and powerless. By the higher spiritual law enunciated by Christ, the weak and the meek shall certainly in the end inherit the Earth. The strong ones destroy some and enslave the majority of the weak. But I have shown how in the end the strong slavemasters, by reason of the vices and the sloth, which the possession of slaves and servants and superfluous wealth inevitably leads to, are destroyed. Their children

become in time the weak ones and the children of the oppressed weak become the strong ones of the future. Let there be no mistake: laws of nature are certainly powerful but above them, are the laws of the supernatural i. e., of the spirit and the latter are the foundation upon which the former are based.

Nature does not consider the burden imposed by the strong upon the weak as unmerciful. She has her own ideas of mercy, truer and nobler than we have. The children of the weak always supplant the children of the strong ultimately. The oppression of the strong are the only means by which weak living beings can of their own free will develop their latent powers. God apparently has not created all perfect beings, all like God. But He delights in seeing His children as free beings nobly developing the latent powers, with which they have been endowed, into glorious forms and achieving their own salvation. Eyes and ears have been developed by the pain of the struggling animal. All perception has been developed in pain and labour. The glories of the creation exist only in the perception of living beings, for without eyes of the free individual, it has no beauties and is dull and dark as hell. Without ears it has no music and is silent and sad beyond measure. Without distress and misery and weakness it can have no benevolence and no love and is a dull and unbearably monotonous world, worse than hell. Without freedom there can be no life. The Father requires the free-will offering of His children and their love which is born of freedom. He helps the individual without interfering with his free-will, like the ordinary human father and friend.

Atheists, pantheists and other philosophical non-believers who make the world synonymous with God, deny the love of God towards the individual and what is called His special providence, because their ideas of special providence are only consistent with a limited God and with the elimination of the freewill of the individual. The philosophers and the scientists and the religious men are still engrossed with material ideas of benevolence and of heaven and hell, and their spirit is but gross matter. The elixir of life, which Zanon, Lytton's spiritual philosopher, sought for, was grossly materialistic. The hero and the heroine of Marie Corielli's *Ever lasting Life* are very gross material minded wealthy human beings, steeped in the pursuit and enjoyment of the sensual pleasures and luxuries of the rich. The true spiritual plane is being slowly evolved, unknown to the philosophers and the leisured saints, in the huts and cottages of the poor working classes. In the material world, the strong always triumph and ride rough-shod upon the weak. In the spiritual world, truth, justice and goodness prevail over falsehood, injustice and evil.

The spiritual world is the immutable foundation upon which the material world is built. The immaterial points and lines compose the solid body and the idea of form is at the root of points and lines and bodies. But the points, the lines and the ideas of form and of time and space of the Kantian philosophy still partake of the nature of the material. The spiritual world, upon which again these all-but immaterial ideas are based, is as far removed in its immateriality from points and lines as these latter are

from solid bodies. What is the pure spiritual plane? It is there that the Kingdom of Heaven shines. It is slowly developing in the consciousness of living beings. Surely it is coming. It was but right that Jesus taught man to pray for it daily and to strive to the utmost of his power to bring it about.

Common life
in the light of
the spirit.

Judge the common life in the light of the Spirit and you will find all its uncleanness and uncouthness, all its lowliness and meanness, cleansed and illuminated by the light of the truth of real life and all its pains glorified by the birth of nobler species. Think not poor, labouring, panting, insulted, trampled down man and woman, engaged in the life and death struggle for existence, that you are naught and uncared for by Providence. You are surely more precious and dear to the merciful Father than the comfortable man, be he king or noble or multi-millionaire, scientist or philosopher, yogee or saint, who is not obliged to undergo any part of your toil and pain, for it is your pain and labour which develop this wonderful universe into finer forms. The common life is surely noble and let nobody repine at his lot of labour and pain. Let not man in his pain advise his fellow to curse God and die, for the merciful Father and Mother is surely near at hand and forgets not the meanest of His creatures. Only His immeasurable love transcends our understanding as it is wholly spiritual. As soon as one is convinced of the spiritual basis of all things, he can wait patiently and hopefully for the ultimate glorious result. The merciful law of our life is that the individual willingly sacrifices itself for the species and

for higher life. This sacrifice of the common and the weak in the species should be remembered. Let man and woman do his or her duty in life and leave the rest to God, remembering what his or her sacrifice means. Let every one strive for the Kingdom of God to the best of his understanding and power and remember that he has for his partner and co-worker the great Architect and that his sufferings and labours shall surely produce the Good.

There is one special advantage which the ordinary poor weak man possesses over his strong, rich and powerful neighbour. The latter depends more on his own power and will than the former. His power and will drive the world of life forward in its course of progress. But he is impressed less with idea of the powerlessness of man before the overwhelming forces of nature than the weak common man. He considers himself as the agent, who by his efforts is destined to bring about the kingdom of heaven. Power and force and pride of will and self-reliance are good and noble. They bring the forces of nature under subjection and free the spirit from the bondage of matter. But nevertheless, it is true that no living being could have existed or progressed only by its unaided effort. No baby could exist without the help of the mother. Nobody would grow without the help of his father. Man could not progress without teachers, society and state. This we know. We go further and know that the help of an unseen and unknown Power, outside matter, parents, society and state, is necessary for life and its progress. A bacillus can destroy the life of the most intellectual

Special advantage of the weak.

and the greatest among men in a few minutes. Man is powerful against nature but he is also utterly helpless against it and would merge again into dead unreasoning matter without the help of the unseen and unknown Power. The weak and the poor ones of the earth are more conscious of their helplessness than their more fortunate brothers and they depend more on the unseen Helper than the latter. In their despair they clasp to their bosom stocks and stones and images and even the void space and fancy they obtain help, solace and rest. The strong and the rich and the powerful can have no such experience. If there really be a Helper the weak and the lowly have a great advantage over the strong and the proud. Life has mysteries which can not be fathomed. The ways of the mysterious Power that governs the universe are little known. It is possible that the master really serves the slave, though we find the latter cruelly driven by the former. Masterfulness is necessary but dependence is also necessary. The truly wise man knows of what little worth he is and how liable he is to inevitable misery, decay and death. He may strive to bring the powers of nature under his subjection but still he feels that in reality he is not stronger or less liable to the inevitable misery than the lowest and the weakest among his fellow-men. He considers himself as one of the common weak lowly men, who must depend on the unseen Power. Indeed the highest wisdom is to exercise and develop to the utmost the powers of our life and to work out our freedom and to be conscious at the same time of the fact of the unavoidable and inevitable helplessness of life and to ask for help and to obtain it.

Even after doing your best you ought to know that failure may be the end of all. Robert Louis Stevenson said: "There is indeed one element in human destiny that not even blindness itself can controvert. Whatever else we are intended to do we are not intended to succeed; failure is the fate allotted". The rich, the great and the successful ones have the disadvantage of perceiving the fact only at the end of their career when it is too late. The poor and the unsuccessful are always painfully conscious of it. William James says rightly: "Our nature being thus rooted in failure is it any wonder that theologians shall have held it to be essential and thought that only through the personal experience of humiliation which it engenders, the deeper sense of life's significance is reached".* This sense of failure and personal experience of humiliation at the hands of your fellows are necessary for the evolution of the higher life as it impels to do one's best. Do your best, for thereby you will inherit power and freedom. But after doing your best, you must and you ought to depend on the Father, whose will is the best for you and for all. We do not know His will and we cannot fathom His ways. The highest wisdom is to seek His will and try to act according to it.

The philosophers of ancient times rightly said that man could not control his destiny, which led to ultimate misery and death here. True philosophy was according to them to accept the inevitable with equanimity. Their philosophy certainly led to great philosophic peace and contentment in the mind. They

* Varieties of Religious Experience p. 138.

desired nothing. To them no pleasures or happiness were worth having, as by their very nature they were ephemeral and led to misery. That is the philosophic life and it is surely worth having. It is claimed by philosophers that perfect peace and contentment can be had without believing in God. But after all is said and done, it must be admitted that our life is distracted with pain and sorrow. Failure is felt to be the "allotted fate" of life by all men, great philosophers and scientists, successful generals and statesmen, by the very rich and as well as by the very poor, when they become old. Knowledge of God and His loving touch alone transform this universe of pain and sorrow into a place of glory. The believer in God can have the truly philosophic mind by believing that the unfathomable will of God which governs this life, is best for us and that after doing our best we should be indifferent to our final apparently inevitable miserable fate, as the Father knows best. The philosophers and wise men are noble, it must be admitted. The atheist with the ethical philosophic life, if it be possible for him to attain it, is a superman and utterly noble and strong. But certainly the philosophy of the believer in God is truer, more real and more natural. This philosophy, the common ignorant poor weak man can have if he believes in God. Thus we poor common men can have the highest philosophy in our common lives by believing in God more truly than the philosophers. The highest wisdom therefore is to depend on the will of the Father, to seek it and work in unison with it and to be indifferent to the ills of life.

CHAPTER XV.

THE LIFE ETERNAL.

The question of immortality of individual life has been considered in all the previous chapters. At the end of this long treatise it should be briefly considered again. Two things must not be forgotten. First, the sure knowledge that individual life is immortal and will surely become better is incompatible with all effort and with all goodness and thus with all progress. Nobody with such knowledge will hesitate to commit any crime for self-gratification nor will he undergo any trouble or labour. Second, the sure knowledge that the merciful Father exists and is always taking care of us, that the God, who is never angry and whose love is above all other love, exists is also incompatible with effort, goodness and progress. Thus the uncertainty of the knowledge of these two matters must accompany life so long as it does not attain to that stage of progress, when wisdom, goodness and other spiritual pursuits will predominate over all material pursuits and when the attainment of higher and nobler and more spiritual life will be greater incentives of action than the maintenance of any present state of ease and pleasure. Till that stage of life is attained certain knowledge of immortality of life and of God is not compatible with the constitution and purpose of life and is injurious to progress.

We have found before that the idea of God has been growing with the evolution of higher life. The

same thing has happened with the idea of immortality of individual life. There might or not might not have been a latent feeling of immortality in the subliminal consciousness of man but in his ordinary surface consciousness there was originally no such feeling and it is doubtful whether even in the heart of the most learned philosophers of the present day there is such a feeling. The historical fact is that this feeling is growing in the hearts of men. The primitive man had no greater consciousness of his immortality than an insect or a beast. Ancient history tells us that civilized man in early times had no such consciousness. The Jews did not believe in it. They worshipped God but even the saintly Job and the devout David did not seem to worship God for non-worldly goods or to believe in the continuance of life after death. The belief in metempsychosis of the savage man which the philosophers of ancient India developed in the doctrine of the transmigration of souls, slowly led to the idea of the immortality of individual existence. The Buddhists further developed the idea. But Hindus and Buddhists did not in reality believe in immortality. All life and all gods, even the highest among them, came to an end; the series of transmigrations ended in absorption in the Absolute, according to Hindus, and in Nirvana or extinction, according to Buddhists. Absorption in the Absolute and Nirvana or extinction are in their essence indistinguishable. Thus eternal persistence of individual existence and consciousness, was no part of the philosophy of the ancients, and the modern philosophers, who are believers in pantheism, panpsychism and other modern

speculations, stand in the same position as the ancients. The resurrection of Christ did not prove immortality but it proved that he was God. The Christian idea was and even now is that all men on death remain dead till the last day when they will be resurrected by God and then will begin for a few an eternal life of pleasure and for the great many there will be death (which was the Jewish idea) or an infinite life of pain. That there would be a continuation of life after death in heaven or hell was an idea of Hindus and Buddhists borrowed from them with later illogical modifications by the Essenes and the Alexandrian philosophers, and from the latter, by the Christian Jews. * The Christian idea surely is not the true idea of immortality of the soul. Further life after death is described in the revealed books of the Christians, Muhammadans, Hindus, and is considered by others also who believe in the doctrine, as being merely a continuation of existence in a body like the present with all its senses stereotyped

*Moses and all Hebrew literature, we are told by Hebrew scholars assumed the soul's natural mortality. Orthodox Christianity has persisted in that opinion. Dr. Dodwell agreed with St. Paul and said that the soul was naturally and per se perishable but made immortal by the grace of Christ in the case of believers.

A Christian writer reviewing a recent book by Professor Thompson says : " It is necessary to guard against the confusion of thought that has arisen through identifying Resurrection or survival of physical death with Immortality. Without survival after death all religion would of course be impossible; but to suppose that such survival connotes eternal life in every case is to rob the creator " Who only hath immortality (Timothy. VI. 16) of one of his chief attributes ** The "wretched presentations of the Sistine Chapel and in the frescoes of the Last Judgment in the Campsanto of Pisa and many another city " would never have been painted had not a corrupt and apostate Church substituted the pagan belief in the inherent immortality of the soul for the biblical declaration that "the soul that sinneth, it shall die " Professor Thomson in his book " A not impossible religion " repudiated eternal hell-fire and atonement but defended the doctrines of redemption, incarnation and of the Trinity—so great is the force of inherited superstition ! But nevertheless his book has been declared unchristian.

for all time with unending sensual pleasures or pains, like those of the present human body. Even the spiritualists have no higher idea of life after death. Sir Oliver Lodge's Raymond smokes a cigar after death. Neither the Buddhist nor the Christian idea in its reality is the idea of the eternal persistence of individual consciousness eternally progressing to more and more spiritual forms. That idea has grown and has been developing in the mind of man from the savage man's idea of metempsychosis and the philosophic transmigration of souls. Man has not even now apprehended its full meaning.

We have however found that though these two ideas of God and immortality were not in the surface-consciousness of primitive life and have been growing and coming more and more to the surface, deep down in the subliminal consciousness they have existed and played the most potent part in the evolution of higher life. They have compelled living beings to subordinate every thing and to sacrifice itself for the evolution of the future species and of the nobler individual. When this fact will be clearly established no doubt will be felt about these two all important matters.

These two ideas embodied in the inner consciousness have been potent factors in evolution of higher life.

Let us now consider the question in the light of philosophy and facts of science. At the very outset the meaning of eternal must be defined. Eternity has three different meanings as described by Professor Mackenzie in Dr. Hasting's recent book on the Encyclopædia of Religions and Ethics. It denotes, (1) an unending extent of time, (2) that which is essentially timeless and (3) that

Three meanings of eternity.

which includes time and somehow transcends it. The first is the popular idea of time being unending in both ends, in the past and the future. The Hindu philosopher therefore logically says that that which has a beginning must have an end and that life is unending in both ends and there must be transmigration. Many European philosophers on this view assert that reality must be beyond time and eternal or having no ends, and the time-view of the phenomenal universe is a mere illusion. Truths of science and physical laws and space and time and the categories of Kant come within the second description and are timeless for we cannot conceive of them as coming into existence at a certain point of time or ceasing to exist at a future time. Matter and force and motion also are supposed by some to be within this category. Life however cannot be conceived as timeless. It exists in time and those that believe in eternally progressive individual life say that it comes within the third category and that it is in time but somehow transcends it.

There is a great dividing line between matter, laws of matter, and ideas connected with matter and life. The former are dead, essentially unchanging, timeless and eternal. Life and all ideas connected with life are always changing and assuming newer and more advanced forms. These forms are sometimes so new and contrary to the preceeding forms that they cannot be conceived as having any connection with the latter as has been fully described before (p. 112). Life does not create time, but without it there would be no idea of time and thus, in one sense, no time.

Life and
time.

Life however can exist only in time. There can be consciousness and feeling only in time. Thus life and time co-exist and connote one another. That being so, life cannot be timeless, which means dead entity, and is not eternal in that sense. The question is, is it eternal in the first or the third sense of the term. If it is existing in an unending extent of time, it existed before and will exist hereafter. Whether life existed on the earth before it cooled to a degree sufficient for the existence of life as at present supposed has not yet been answered by science with certainty. Thus that is a matter for speculation. The other alternative is that life has come to exist in time but transcends it by continuing to infinite time.

Life is always becoming.

Becoming applies to the individual only and proves immortality.

The one great distinguishing characteristic of life is that it is always becoming. It is assuming higher, nobler and more spiritual forms. It is based on and affected by the earlier forms, but the spiritual element in the later forms seems to be a new creation. In this sense the process of creative evolution of life described by Bergson does not seem to be mere fancy. Now what we find is that becoming can only apply to an individual and not to a species except as it is an aggregate of individuals. The species is more lasting than the individual, but it too passes away after evolving a higher species. The aggregate of living individuals which are *becoming* is immortal. The question is whether the individual that has life is immortal? Life connotes *becoming*. If all individuals inevitably cease to exist, there can be no *becoming* and there can be no evolution of higher life. The spiritual element in life is creative, it is always recreating

itself and for its use and development disposing of matter and creating within limits and is thus always and without ceasing becoming newer and higher and is eternal. The species or any aggregate of individuals can not be supposed to have this characteristic of life,—it cannot be *becoming*. The *whole* of the philosophers' so-called ocean of life, can not be *becoming*. The pantheists are logically right when they say that the *whole* can not really change and they deduce therefrom that change in the individual or part is only illusory. Bergson's arrogation of *becoming* to the *whole* is unreal. The individual alone can be *becoming*. Thus without the individual being conceived as eternal there can be no *becoming* in the universe of life. Time depends on change and *becoming*. Life and *becoming* can be only in time but they transcend time. The spirit that is in the individual is always breaking through limitations and transcending time and space and all other affections of matter.

Further, the fact found by biology is that there was practically all but no consciousness and no individuality in rudimentary life. They slowly developed with the growth of life and became greater and greater with the coming of higher life. Man's consciousness and individuality are thus imperfect and will become greater in future. Perfect consciousness and perfect individuality are eternal ; it is " a *totum simul* " of the Greek and European theologians in which the " human distinctions of past and future disappear in the eternal present." But in life there is only becoming

Conscious-
ness and
individual
growing.

better and no perfection. Thus the question is, is the imperfectly developed consciousness eternal? The Buddhist philosopher shows that the individual of a past moment has changed and is not the individual of the present moment. The imperfect individuality passes away and a more perfect individuality takes its place. But there is a continuity in a living individual in childhood and old age while in the body. Is there any persistence of the self after the dissolution of the body, is the question. The materialist says that it is the body which brings into existence this sense of unity; without it, such sense is not possible. This sense of unity, which means sense of limitation attaching to a material body, is produced by being circumscribed within limits.

There would be no consciousness and no individuality, if there were no limitations and the living being were *totum simul*. As has been shown before, in the most rudimentary organism there is a sense of individuality, or Vijnana or the apprehension of the Ego and of the non-Ego or the outside world. This sense of the Ego is the result of life chafing at its limitations. As higher forms are evolved, this revolt and struggle against limitation become keener, and greater individuation or individuality and greater freedom are the result of the process. The living being conquers slowly its limitations and acquires faculties and powers of resistance, enjoyment goodness, wisdom and the like, which it had not before. Higher individuality means nothing more than higher life. Now this higher individuality or higher life

Higher life possible if individual life is immortal.

Can only be possible if there is persistence of individual life through the various grades of life, as it is the result of individual effort only.

It is said that the species is immortal but not the individual. No doubt the individuals of a certain species have instincts impressed upon their bodies in common and they go through the identical processes of growth decay and death. Thus they may be said to be indistinguishable from the species. But biologists have discovered that there can be no evolution, far less evolution of the *better*, unless there is a variation or diversity in the individuals. Every individual, be it a plant, beast or man, is distinguishable from its brothers. It is the struggle of the individual against its fetters that leads to variation and to its distinctive characteristics which are of such a nature that they can not be merely results of the influence of environment. The higher life cannot be the product of any material combination or mere material circumstances. The species is like dead matter. It is the individual that produces the higher life. It can not do so unless it persists; for the species passes away. The philosopher says, the varied distinct individuals are like the variegated tints which a ray of the sun impresses on broken glass or other such material substance; life is one and its various forms are due only to its various environments. The truth is, the physical body and the environments of life, in the beginning in the rudimentary forms of life had and even now in the embryonic state, have no

Species is not immortal but the individual produces the variations and consequence is higher life,

distinctive characteristics.* Indeed embryologists say that the process of evolution is exemplified in the embryo which has to go through all the stages of its preceding forms of anthropoid ape and other lower beasts and still lower forms of life. The body is practically identical in form at the inception of life, it is the individual that changes it to suit its diosyncracies, so far as it can. It is the individual that creates its own distinctive colours; they are not produced for it by its material body. The individual by constant repeated action which produces habit and instinct or Sankara, impresses some of its characteristics on the reproductive element in its body and by the limited creative power possessed by it preserves the species and transmits its instincts on its children. The creative or matter-disposing power of the living being, the biologist has to admit is manifest in every action of its functions. The power of reproduction especially is inexplicable by any material laws and can not but be the result of a certain creative power. But even then it is not possible for one or two individual living beings to procreate another individual being with characteristics different from their own and with the latent power of evolving a higher form of life. This can only be the result of the co-operation of the Creator of higher life, Who in conjunction with His children struggling for the noble result, is always creating the better, the more beautiful, the nobler and the more spiritual life.

*"Great specializations occur at every level but there is beyond doubt a progressive differentiation and integration" says Professor Thomson in his book on Evolution (p.99) and life thus "presses upwards". This is true.

The individual is all important in life. Without its persisting through the various grades of life, evolution becomes inexplicable.

Death is the penalty of greater individuation, says the biologist. In matter there is no death. The protozoa do not seem to die. Higher individuation means greater power over the physical organism but its penalty is death. The reason is clear: the machinery of the body is imperfect and without a more perfect machinery higher life is not possible. Thus the machinery of the present must cease to exist if higher life has to be evolved. It is possible that the individual works unconsciously and involuntarily for the evolution of the higher machinery, as it does in such things as propagation of the species, by the sacrifice of its particular physical organism. But it is not consistent with ordinary reason that an individual should long for a new house which he does not expect to inhabit himself. Higher individuation or greater self-consciousness would make such an involuntary effort increasingly more difficult. Thus if progress be unending, it is only compatible with the persistence of the individual life which attains greater and greater self-consciousness with greater reason and greater goodness.

To the individual living being, the poignant present is its real life, the past is naught excepting in so far as it modifies its present feelings, say the Buddhists and materialists. But the truth is the individual is in reality engrossed in the future. Biology proves the fact. The individual appears to act as if it were engrossed with

the life of the present moment but as a matter of fact, it procreates and does most of its vital acts, for the present and the future species; indeed it sacrifices itself for living beings which will come into existence in the far distant future (see p. 270). All the struggles and efforts of the individual are for the future. It is inconceivable that unless in its inmost consciousness it was convinced that life would persist in the future, and further that its own individual existence would persist in the far distant future, such action could be possible. Thus the laws of biology and the undoubted facts of life point to the persistence of individual life.

Matter is indestructible but combinations of matter as such are ephemeral. If life is a product of matter and if reason, individuality, goodness, mercy and altruism are merely affections of matter, there can be no immortality. But if these are partially at least immaterial and spiritual, there can be no death of the immaterial element and the individual exists after the dissolution of the body. The whole question therefore hinges on the fact whether intelligence in its highest form, purest goodness and the like are results of material forces. It is impossible to conceive of them as such, as most philosophers and scientists rightly say.

Next let us examine the character of consciousness. The nature of consciousness, say the philosophers, proves the immortality of the individual soul as a part of the universal Soul, the distinctions being illusory or accidental. The question of immortality to some extent depends on the nature of consciousness. If it is a fact as asserted by Hindu Yogees that the events of past lives may be remembered, im-

mortality is demonstrated. But that claim of the Yogees has not been substantiated by proper evidence. The biologist however helps the Yogee by proving that the impressions of innumerable species, which have evolved the species, man, are embedded in the consciousness of all men and not of an individual man merely. How these impressions are transmitted is an unsolved mystery. Admitting the wholly material character of life, the transmission of these impressions can not be explained. The argument from the analogy of the cart by the famous Buddhist philosopher Nagasena in the *Milinda Prasna* is in agreement with the position of the materialistic biologists. But after the destruction of the cart, if it is reconstructed, its motion only can be explained and the analogy between the cart and the living organism can not further be extended. The instincts, in the formation of which individuality had a part, can not be explained nor the peculiar distinctive characteristics of each individual. On the other hand, it is not the experiences peculiar to an individual that assert themselves but the experiences of the species that become instincts that dominate life. The flux of life of Bergson may reconcile the difficulty. But we have seen before how that idea without individual existence is illusory and no better than pure materialism.

The Hindu philosopher attempted to reconcile all difficulties by the assertion, which was adopted by European philosophers, that consciousness in its essence is "an intuition in which the distinctions, past and future, disappear". This led to the fantastic stories of the Yoga Vasista, which

were intended to illustrate how in a second an individual may pass through a hundred births with all their experiences for a thousand years, thus proving the identity of consciousness of individuals with that of the Brahman. Modern European philosophers in their doctrines have put only modern garbs on the old doctrine. It is no doubt true that there can be no cognition except when there is an apprehension of unity, like the apprehension "of unity in diversity and successiveness in time, and of melody in music with the succession of different sounds." But modern philosophers go to an untenable position when they say that consciousness "by nature is able to realize at once the whole content of time, past, present and future" * and that in principle we possess and are acquainted with the nature of such a consciousness, whenever we do experience any succession as a whole" †. If this were true, eternity of the conscious self and its identity with God were proved. But the position is inconsistent with the facts of life and consciousness as found by biology.

We have seen before that consciousness develops with the development of life. It is at first so diffused that it is difficult to call it self-consciousness. It concentrates with the growth of life and acquires higher and higher qualities. Psychology supports biology and shows that in consciousness there are degrees. The lower consciousness apprehends fewer and less complex facts and ideas and less of the sequence of events in time or of succession as a whole

* Pattison's Idea of God p. 334.

† Professor Rayce's. The World and the Individual.

at one cognition. The time-sense does not arise from cognition or pure consciousness. It arises from memory. Bergson says : " The world of physics is not in time at all, real duration begins with life and that organic memory which shows itself in the formation of habits. Changes for the living being are experiences by which it learns, by which its very nature is moulded." The time-sense depends on memory but the positions of Bergson about organic memory and habit are not tenable and are manifestly materialistic. We have considered before the facts connected with memory and the theories of functional memory enunciated by biologists. We have shown there that above and beyond the memory as a quality of material combinations, there is a higher memory found by great scientists, independent of such combinations.

The higher spiritual memory, which also grows with the development of life, shows that the individual living being has an element in life which is not material and which is always transcending the limits of space and time. There is no reason to suppose that element in life passes away with the body unless it be merely a manifestation and an illusory manifestation of the timeless perfect consciousness of Brahman. But that spiritual element in the consciousness of living beings is progressive and not perfect and absolute and cannot be the Brahman.

Consciousness is consciousness no doubt of physical changes in succession in time but it is also consciousness of beauty and melody and goodness and mercy, the ideas of which are growing, because

in life there is no absolute idea of beauty and the like. All ideas connected with life, as has been shown before, are always changing and assuming new and previously unknown forms. These changing ideas no doubt exist in time but they are changing for the better and the higher eternally. It is not possible to conceive of their so changing except as belonging to an individual becoming better eternally.

As life grows in individuality, wisdom, goodness and spirituality, the distinctions between individuals become greater though finer. Professor Bosanquet in his recent book on the value and destiny of the individual agreeing with Spinoza and Hegel says that the distinctions between selves is 'formal' and "depends on what are at bottom unessential limitations, such as the fact of differences of vital feeling, depending as a rule on the belonging of different selves to different bodies." He and Professor Pattison say that the experiences of men are common and the contents of self "are essentially shareable. In social interests and purposes the individual becomes one with his fellows ; and in science and philosophy, religion and art, he shares those universal interests which are the common heritage of humanity. It is obvious therefore that there must be an identity of content in all selves." Naturally they can not understand "what was to be gained by so immense a multiplication of contents all but identical".* This is another phase of pantheism which is identical

*Pattison's *Idea of God* pp. 262-5. Bosanquet's *Value and Destiny of Life* p. 53

with materialism, and all its arguments are on the assumption that matters concerning life have to be judged by material standards. The common shareable experiences and instincts all are material and go with the species. Distinctness produces the individual, *who is an individual because he is distinguishable from his brothers*. The social interests are common so far as they are material interests. Science and philosophy, so far as they deal with timeless, unchangeable physical laws, must be one to all men. But in all ideas connected with life there cannot be identity of content. Take beauty. So far as it is based on forms connected with matter it must be shareable. But the spiritual appreciation of it, which is based on the material form but which is still something quite apart from it, is different in every individual. Take goodness. The idea of it so far as it is based on material interests is shareable in common. But the spiritual element in it is perceived differently by different individuals. There would be no beauty and no goodness if they were like material facts and laws, constant, unchangeable and common to all. Ideas of beauty, goodness and the like are always changing and can not be common except as mentioned above. The philosopher says that all spiritual entities, like beauty melody, goodness and wisdom, as they grow, approximate one another. The Prajna Paramita therefore says that omniscience is produced by perfect purity and is identical with it. Buddha Ghosha says that mercy accompanies and is identical with perfect quietness of soul. There is some truth in these

spiritual observations. All ideas connected with life as life grows, become simultaneously better and thus seem to accompany one another. But they never become identical. The speculation is the old speculation of the absolute goodness, purity and wisdom. I have shown before, life knows of no such absolute standard. The ideas are continually changing, growing and becoming better. The result is the consequence of variations in the individual. In the kingdom of the Spirit, the variations and distinctions become greater and finer as life grows and *they alone give interest to life*. Without them life would be utterly uninteresting and unbearable.

The philosophers who deduce from the common feelings and experiences of men that essentially they are one and the distinctness of many consciousnesses is only formal and the result of forced limitation only support the Vedanta which more logically says that the distinctness of consciousness is a result of Maya or illusion. That conclusion is irresistible if essentially distinct and lasting individual life is denied. The philosophers fell into a grave mistake because they were ignorant of the fact of growing consciousness found by biology. Life is growing from matter or all but matter to pure spirit. The material element in life must be similar in all. The inherited instincts show the fact. The protozoa which propagate by division must be identical with one another. In the lower organisms the individuals are practically indistinguishable from one another. Insects, fish and sheep have nearly identical feelings. Hydrogen and oxygen mixed form water and one drop of water is indistinguishable

from another. The material element in life can have no distinctness.

But the chief characteristic of life, biology teaches us, is capacity for variation. Self-consciousness which connotes freedom of action leads to idiosyncrasy and variation. This freedom of action and purposiveness and variation based on them are the causes of the evolution of the higher species and all that is great and noble good and beautiful. Thus the evolution of greater and greater self-consciousness leads to greater spirituality. The spirit is very unlike matter. The distinctness of individuality becomes greater with higher and more spiritual life and does not become less and less and does not finally disappear by coalescence with other individuals, as is supposed by philosophers. This fact of greater individuality and greater distinctness in consciousness with the evolution of higher life goes to show the continuity of individual life. If individual life ceased with the dissolution of the body, the following results would follow: (1) all life would be extinct in time; (2) the evolution of higher life would not be possible, for "earth to earth" having coalesced there would be no reason for the evolution of higher life; (3) there would be no increasing distinctness and no greater individuality with the evolution of higher life. It is not a fact that with greater culture and higher civilization the individuals of a species approximate one another. Sheep are practically indistinguishable from one another; monkeys and savage men are only a little better. The distinctness of consciousness becomes greater even among themselves in

Greater distinctness with higher life shows immortality.

the higher species, proving conclusively the immaterial character of consciousness •

In abnormal conditions of sub-consciousness distinctness of individuality shown.

Again instinctive action and emotions and latent feelings like instinctive fear derived from remote ancestors, which come to the surface-consciousness in abnormal conditions of the mind, are attempted to be explained by functional memory but to the ordinary man the fact seems improbable unless functional memory can act upon a continuous consciousness. However that may be, in subliminal consciousness which manifests itself in abnormal and diseased conditions of the mind, when a persons loses his control over the material constitution of his body, the functional memory which then manifests is not identical in all men but is often of a staggeringly distinct character showing idiosyncrasies of individuality. The inference of persistence of individual life after the dissolution of the body seems difficult to resist, as otherwise there will be little variation in the phenomena manifested, they being only involuntary action of matter in which there must be unchangeable regularity.

The marvels of telepathy, clairvoyance, clairaudience and the more frequently found unusual power of smell of distant things, it must be mentioned here, prove the unity of the soul and its independence of the sense-organs. But clairvoyance and the like have not yet been universally recognized by scientists. We must therefore consider the question of the unity of the perceiving Ego from the standpoint of accepted science. Condillac's famous statue is here of service. He imagined a statue endowed with five

senses in succession and showed that each one was sufficient to produce the most essential ideas from which all knowledge was formed. He considered however that the feeling of touch alone gave the idea of objectivity and that the others gave us the sense of ourselves being affected. This is only a new materialistic idea and is not true. The very first act of consciousness is the consciousness not only of the Ego but also of the outside world or the non-Ego, which the former connotes and includes. Every idea conveyed by the sense-impressions not only gives us the sense of ourselves being affected but also the sense of being affected by something other than ourselves. The fact proves the existence of the self as an entity distinct from the outside world of experience. But Condillac's position, if true, proves that the self is not dependent on any one single sense for the ideas which are supposed to be peculiarly conveyed by the impressions of the outside world on it. This is the old idea of reducing all sense-impressions to Rupa or ideas of form. One should like very much to have it established that a person born blind may have the idea of colour. But unfortunately it is not possible.

Essential and
and irreconcil-
able differ-
ences of sense-
impressions.

Intensity of light is a constant quality but the constitution of the eyes of different animals being different, the same idea of colour cannot be carried to the consciousness of different animals. The effect of the action of the electric disturbance which produces the sense of colour may be felt by the blind man and some impression may be imagined to be produced. Helmholtz discussing this matter says : "The auditory nerve translates every thing into pheno-

Sense-impressions and unity of self.

mena of sound, the nerves of the skin into sensations of temperature and touch. The same electric current whose existence is indicated by the optic nerve as a flash of light or by the organ of taste as an acid flavour, excites in the nerves of the skin the sensation of burning. The same ray of sunshine which is called light, when it falls on the eye, we call heat, when it falls on the skin" (Goethe's *Scientific Researches*). From this a modern writer infers that "if the same electric current affects us into many different ways, has so many different meanings for us now a colour, now a taste what is in itself"?* The simple answer is that it is an electric current and nothing more or less, though it affects differently the different organs of sense. The mystery lies elsewhere. Helmholtz rightly says: "The most complete difference offered by our several sensations that namely between those of light, of hearing, of taste, of smell and of touch, the deepest of all distinctions, so deep that it is impossible to draw any comparison of likeness or unlikeness between the sensations of colour and of musical tones does not as we now see at all depend upon the nature of the external object but upon the central connections of the nerves which are affected."*

No theory of the action of material force or energy can explain this phenomenon of a central conscious something which is affected differently by the same physical fact as conveyed to it by its different organs of sense, and especially the fact

*Helmholtz's *Sensation of sight*. See Pattison's *Idea of God*.

that the differences in the affections are so great in kind that they can hardly be called differences. It would be droll to say that the heat on the skin produced by an electric current is different from the flash of light seen. There is no material connection between the two. They are not comparable on a material basis. But they are compared and distinguished by man in his consciousness. The agent that perceives the distinctions must be immaterial. These impressions must again be resolvable into a common principle as they are produced by the same cause on the same agent. That common principle also must be a non-material one, like form, but still connected with matter, and be a mediating link between matter and spirit. Hindu philosophers assert that the modes of music have forms. It is asserted by some scientists that music produces certain forms and figures on a very sensitive filament. Science as it advances will slowly resolve the different sensations into more and more simple principles which would seem to be more and more comparable but in their essence they shall remain distinct and not comparable. However that may be, scientists and philosophers agree that there is a central something which not only apprehends the different sensations but apprehends the differences and the distinctions between them, which is an act of the spirit which material causes can not produce. There is something called self, which is above all material things and which with its organs of sense like the tentacles of a spider seizes external material objects, feeds upon them, enjoys them controls them and is also so controlled by

them as to, assume newer and higher forms. The power of life over external objects of life is shown by biology, and of such power of the individual direct proof is furnished by telepathy, clairvoyance, clairsaudience supersensuous smell and the like. The investigations into these abnormal and generally diseased conditions of the mind will explain in time many things which now seem inexplicable. Until materialistic science can explain the facts mentioned above, which are only compatible with a central self which is both material and non-material, we common men shall believe in it and, as has been shown before, we are compelled by an imperative law in our life to believe in it.

Scientists admit the truths of hypnotism and suggestion. The deranged machinery of the brain can be made to work to order from outside acting through the will of the medium. It is admitted that the order from outside cannot influence the brain machinery but it can influence the will and the will so influenced puts the brain working as desired. The fact proves two things: first, that the powers of individual life, when put into a condition of passivity and comparative freedom from fetters of matter and distraction, becomes super-sensitive to suggestions from an outside will, which has been found to be partly material and partly spiritual; and secondly, that the brain machinery is not the dominant motive power of life but it is only a machinery at the disposal of the Will, which means at the disposal of a central disposing agent, partly material, partly spiritual, which pervades and governs the body, though to be sure only to a limited extent.

The philosophic doctrines of layers of consciousness have to be revised in the light of modern biological discoveries. Dr. Henry Head has recently shown that "man's brain has reached its present eminence by the growth and domination of the cerebral hemispheres, the seat of man's higher faculties. They have attained their position by mastering and bringing under control a world of ancient lower centres which did almost independent duties in jungle days. So long as the higher centres of the brain are normal, they control the lower but if they become damaged then the lower and more ancient instinctive and emotional centres are let loose and overpower the higher. These afford a clue to mental disorders like hysteria. The cerebral hemispheres attain their dominant position in the growing human embryo and their gradual increase as we ascend the animal scale.' The lower centres in the brain often acted independently and without control. But there was some central control as otherwise the bodily functions could not be carried out. Less control means less individuation. Greater control means greater individuation. The higher individual required a machinery of the cerebral hemispheres for easy control of the lower centres and they came into existence. The damaging of the higher controlling centre may let loose the lower centres with instinctive emotions of past ages and explain hysteria and ghost-possession and insanity but cannot explain the phenomena of clairvoyance and the like. There is a central controlling agency or individuated life in the most rudimentary organism. Greater individuation is accompanied with finer machinery of control.

Further, whatever view we may take of lower and higher centres in the brain-machinery as accompaniments of lower and higher intelligence and memory, both require a *controller*, as in the simple case of memory, lower or higher, which, though it requires the brain-machinery and the sense-organs for its manifestation in life, which has a material element in it, can not come into existence without an intelligent purposive recaller and controller, outside such machinery, which cannot be conceived as wholly material.

The mechanical part of life is patent on the surface. Individuality, power over matter, desire to preserve the species and to evolve the higher species and to attain a nobler life are however the dominant springs of Life. Life as at present known is predominantly material. Hence laws of matter must govern it to a large extent. But the evolution of higher life is the result of non-material laws. If evolution could be explained wholly by material laws, there would be no immortality and no spirit. But from what has been already stated, it is the result of spiritual laws which operate upon and through the individual. Effort and sacrifice can be made only by the individual, and they bring about higher life. It would not and could not have achieved the result, if it were ephemeral.

I have made much of beauty, melody and the like spiritual entities and of their development with the growth of life. But it must be mentioned that the facts may to a great extent be explained by the development of finer machinery in the brain and in the sense-organs. That which is in accord with

that machinery pleases and is called beauty and the like. The development of finer machinery leads, says the biologist, to appreciation of higher beauty. Thus every thing considered spiritual and its growth are sought to be explained. But the development of finer machinery is the result of dissatisfaction with the existing one and of strenuous effort to get a finer one or a better vehicle. But there can be no dissatisfaction and no effort unless there is a consciousness, latent or patent, of higher beauty. Therefore the higher idea of beauty is prior to the evolution of the finer machinery. Much of what we consider beauty and the like is a material phenomenon leading to physical pleasure, dependent wholly on the physical organization. But over and above them, is the spiritual in pure beauty. But after all, beauty and melody are still connected with material phenomena. Goodness and all ideas about life have no such connection. When we find that spiritual ideas grow with the development of life, it seems the individual persists as otherwise such evolution seems difficult to conceive.

Life can only mean individual life. Some quality pervading matter or some substance like ether or space, an ocean of life and the like, are meaningless words intended by materialists and philosophers to make life a quality of matter or something like it. Life's meaning is lost in these dead speculations. Life is warm, throbbing, struggling, sorrowing, rejoicing, thinking, working individual life. If life is immortal, this individual life is immortal, for life in the sense of the philosophers and materialistic scientists is no life but only some dead quality of matter.

Again, consciousness in itself though in time transcends time. Professor Einstein says : " Identity of place is only possible when the sense of time is absolutely annihilated."* He apparently referred to the physical fact of everything being in motion and thus in time and to the impossibility of real sense of identity of place of any particular object. But it can not be denied that a consciousness of identity is possible, and according to him, it can not be in time. It is true, the process of cognition is in time and requires time. A ray of the sun takes some time to reach the visual organ and the working of the organs and the machinery of the brain, though apparently instantaneous, takes a little time, but the ultimate cognition can not be in time and thus cognition though in time transcends time. Further, consciousness and the power of cognition grow and expand. The process of remembering requires time and is in time. The final act however, of recalling a past event as well as of cognizing a present event or of imagining a future event, cannot take any time, though it may in one sense be in time. Again the act of recalling to memory requires the action of the machinery in the brain and thus requires time. But this material memory grows and requires shorter and shorter time for its action on the consciousness. The consciousness never becomes *totum simul* in which the distinction of past, present and future disappear but it approaches that condition with the development of life and in the process transcends time. We have shown before (pp. 165, 166)

*The ancient Greek mathematician Zeno proved that the flying arrow was at rest. Mathematicians, philosophers and scientists have been our guides and teachers but we are often bewildered by their subtlety.

how consciousness and life can and do transcend space and time. If the consciousness of the individual can transcend space and time, it is possible that it can outlast its material body.

Further, the cognition of all ideas connected with life, such as beauty and goodness, is not conveyed by any physical machinery and requires no time. Indeed, these ideas cannot be considered as in time and in the cognition of these ideas, the sense of time has no part and may be said to be absolutely annihilated. Thus consciousness can transcend time and life has an element in it which can transcend time. Further, all this consciousness and these cognitions which are not in time or transcend time are only possible of the individual living being and not of the imaginary ocean of life. Thus there is reason to suppose that the individual persists after the dissolution of its physical body and not merely the pantheistic ocean of life.

The process of evolution of goodness, mercy, art and wisdom and spirituality through group-life or society has a material bearing on the question of immortality of the soul and its character. They have been evolved by the contact of living beings with their fellows. For a solitary living being these are impossible. The sacred fire, as in the Vedic sacrifice, is produced by rubbing the pieces of the sacrificial wood. Materialists are not far from right, when they say morality is obedience to social rules. Indeed, all goodness and spirituality began in the family life and were developed in the social life and state. Group-life exercises an influence which

mere individual life cannot do. Such influence, together with individual effort, produces all goodness and spirituality. Philosophers have therefore dreamt of the ideal State and religious men of the Kingdom of Heaven as a glorified family, society or state. Kant glorified morality and society by laying down that the universe is "a realm of ends, a moral system whose *raison d'être* is the realization of the supreme good in a community of ethical persons."

The speculations Plato, Kant, Hegel and other philosophers about the ideal State or the Kingdom of Heaven are deeply interesting. The most enchanting of them is that of the Bhagabata Vaishnavas of India who imagine the kingdom of heaven to be a society in the elysian regions of song and beauty, where God, one though He is, satisfies all living beings by being the father or mother or brother or friend or playmate or highest of all, husband or paramour of each one. The relationship of affection between the individual living being and God is developed to the highest degree and in various forms and becomes eternal in that kingdom of love, which is higher than the ordinary heaven. There is a great deal of truth in these philosophic and mystic speculations. The basic facts bearing on the matter and the conflict between the individual and society should however be considered.

Mr. Kidd in his social evolution (1914) says: "But we should consider the matter in the light of history and science; the law of life is a law which works for the benefit of the "social organism" and uses the "individual" as a mere means to its ends. But the individual does not resign himself to the

sacrifice without a struggle. The reason, which is in him and makes him the individual that he is, rebels. Reason bids him live for himself, assert himself, enjoy himself. What are organisms to me, cries reason, or I to them? But the law of life is after all triumphant over insurgent reason." Mr. Barker says that the living being arrests the cosmic progress of struggle in which the weaker are destroyed by the stronger "in the interests of an ethical process of struggle directed to the survival of those who are ethically the best. How can natural man evolve this unnatural world of ethics? We seem to need some *deus ex machina*" Dr. Russel Wallace was driven to suppose some "influx" from "the unseen universe of spirits" to solve this difficulty.

Society consists of naturally immoral, unjust and selfish persons. There is no room for justice in the forces of dead nature. "The unfathomable injustice of the nature of things", as Huxley correctly described it, cannot be explained away by words and philosophic arguments. Even in the pure reason of man justice to others at the expense of self is out of place.

No justice
in nature.

How are morality, justice and mercy evolved out of unethical, unjust, cruel nature? Some philosophers would therefore consider the idea of a perfect God necessary for the existence of society. Voltaire was of opinion that the sturdier atheist, Bayle, was wrong in holding that a state of atheists could exist and that "if there were no God he would invent one".

All these speculations are extremely interesting. But we know that the early societies were atheistic,

and immoral. Buddhist countries and the majority of mankind were and are still atheistic. The fact is that man and society in the primitive state had no idea of morality and God. As society advances these two ideas grow more and more and dominate the human mind and state.

Higher ethics
with advancing
state.

The fact remains that society and state, consisting of immoral individuals, by an extraordinary law imposed the rules of morality on man. The individual man has since recognized their rational and noble character. The recognition has led to the progress and development of ethics. The state has even evolved higher mercy in the heart of man. The state thus stands apart from all individuals as the creator and upholder of all ethics and of all noble ideas.

The state is advancing with the progress of man. The modern civilized state is infinitely superior to a savage state. The state that will be evolved in the future will be greatly superior to the modern civilized state. Thus it will go on till eternity. The state on earth is the germ which in its highest evolution will lead to the Kingdom of Heaven.

Kingdom of
Heaven.

The earthly state requires the complete subjection of the free will of the individual and even his sacrifice. As it progresses, that subjection and sacrifice are less and less required. Again, as the state progresses, it is increasingly ruled by reason, mercy, love, goodness and purity. In the Kingdom of Heaven the individual is of equal worth with the species or the state; the free will of the individual is under no

restriction; no sacrifice is required of him; no compulsion and penal sanctions uphold that kingdom; it is wholly based on mercy and love, reason, goodness and purity. It agrees with the description of Kant mentioned above. It is the ideal Kingdom of the Spirit that is being evolved. We do not yet know what it is like to. All that we know is that with its evolution, the evolution of all that is highest and best in life is taking place.

Now this glorious result of the evolution of the Kingdom of Heaven will ensue from group-life or society and state. The question is, if individual life were evanescent, would this result be possible? Society consists of individuals. If all individuals cease to exist, the evolution of goodness, wisdom and spirituality as arising out of the community of individuals, does not seem to be possible. If imperfect individuals alone existed for all time, the result would not be possible, nor is the result compatible with the supposition that all is God or that goodness belongs to group-life alone. Erdmann is right when he says: 'Pantheism leads to the oppression of the individual and so does religions like the worship of aggregates like humanity, while individualism as in Rousseau led to anarchy.'* The position is well-established by facts of history. Without the individual persisting, a pantheistic constitution of the universe or any aggregate of living beings cannot evolve goodness and higher goodness and perfect justice to the individual. Nor can infinite individuals existing for all time out of their unrestrained individualism produce the result. The individual,

Persistent
individual
necessary
the King
of Heaven

*Erdmann's History of Philosophy p. 269.

family, the society, the state, are all necessary. But above all, the co-operation of the Lord of all goodness with the individual living being and with group-life is necessary for the evolution of the glorious result. Such co-operation of the Lord of life with an ephemeral individual is farcical and inconceivable. He the great and living God, in co-operation with His children, is evolving the spiritual and the glorious Kingdom of Heaven, which can be conceived only as "a community of ethical" and spiritual individuals round the Lord of all life and all goodness. Now we may with hesitation guess why man came into existence out of a purpose, inscrutable but certainly merciful and loving, for without the many imperfect living beings, there could be no mercy and no love. The kingdom of God is the kingdom which is the basic spiritual plane of life, in which reason, power, ethics, goodness, mercy, love and other good and noble entities are growing and in which the material is being transformed into the spiritual. The many undeveloped imperfect children of God are there, imperfect, but still sons and daughters, who, even if they are not immortal inheritors of perfection, are co-workers with the Father in bringing into existence the glorious kingdom of the pure spirit. The kingdom of God is with us and around us. This kingdom consists of the many children of God bound together by ineffable ties to one another and to the merciful Father. All progress is evolved in this kingdom and not elsewhere. Without the existence of many individuals, the kingdom of heaven is not conceivable, nor is it

possible to conceive of, that kingdom, where the merciful and just Father reigns, as no better than unethical, unjust, merciless nature which devours her children. All life, every individual, is expecting justice, mercy and love in that kingdom. That expectation is founded on the constitution of life itself. Science and reason strengthen such expectation and refute the arguments of the unbelieving materialist.

Well-founded expectations of mercy and justice hereafter.

Last of all, we come to direct proof of God and immortality of the individual. God and the individual go together. If there is no individual, there is no necessity of God. If there is no God, the individual must be ephemeral, and if it be eternal, the perfectly free and mighty individual must produce chaos and anarchy, in which group-life would be impossible and all goodness and mercy inconceivable. If there be any direct proof of God's influence and love of the individual living being, it is inconceivable that such love and such influence should be exercised on behalf of a fleeting shadow. All saints and devout men have testified to the direct experience of the care and love of God. Among Hindus, hundreds of stories are told, how God or Goddess actually worked for a devotee, how Krishna by carrying the load of Arjuna Misra, in the form of a boy in his absence to his wife, demonstrated the truth of the statement in the Bhagavata Gita that God carried the burdens of his devotees, the correctness of which he was doubting while he was writing his famous commentary on it, how Kali in the shape of a girl repaired the hut of Ramprosad, the sweet singer of Bengal, how God as a boy took by the hand poor

Direct proof of God and immortality.

Billamangal, who had blinded himself for the sake of purity, and led him on his way to the sacred shrines. These are recorded by these saintly authors themselves. Hundreds of such cases are vouched for by the devout of other religions also. The Bible, the Koran, the Book of Saints of Christians, the Lives of Ascetics of Muhammadan Sufis and the Garland Devotees of Hindu Vaishnavas are full of these stories. William James says on this : "Persistence in leaning on the Almighty for support and guidance will bring with it proofs palpable, but much more subtle, of His presence and active influence. The following description of a "led life" by a German writer, whom I have already quoted, would no doubt appear to countless Christians in every country as if transcribed from their own personal experience. One finds in this guided sort of life, says Dr. Hilty : "that books and words and (sometimes people) come to one's cognizance just at the very moment in which one needs them ; that one glides over dangers as if with shut eyes ; * * that paths on which one ought not to wander are as it were hedged off with thorns ; * * one discovers thoughts, talents, yea, even pieces of knowledge and insight in one's self of which it is impossible to say whence they come ; finally that persons help us or decline to help us, favour us or refuse us as if they had to do so against their will, so that often those indifferent or even unfriendly, to us yield us the greatest service and furtherance. The highest resources of worldly wisdom are

* The Varieties of Religious. Experience pp. 472-3

C. Hilty : G Luck Dritter Thal (1900) p. 92.

unable to attain that which under divine guidance comes to us as of its own accord." This is the experience of countless devout men and women. To all truly religious men it is true, as Dr. Hilty says : " One finds that one can wait for every thing patiently and that is one of life's great arts," and every thing occurs to us at the right moment and often in a very striking way, just as if a third person were keeping watch over those things which we are in easy danger of forgetting."* Valmiki, the first of all poets, was an ignorant robber. He is said to have changed his mode of life and to have composed the Ramayana, one of the greatest, most moral and tenderest of epics at the bidding of God. Camden, the cowherd, who did not know how to sing, put the Bible in verse and sang at Divine bidding. Most Indian and many European religious poets have claimed such guidance. To men who have got these experiences, the life immortal is a demonstrated fact, for the God who thus manifests His are and love for them, it is clear, leads them for their eternal good and not for the pleasures of a momentary existence. Direct proof there has always existed for some devout and wise men.

The young train themselves and strive for the better and may get the habit of worshipping God and the attitude of "led life" and they will go nearer to God. The man in the glory of his powers strives to attain the spiritual. God they will find to be with them. But what about such as us, those whose powers are decaying and who are advancing fast towards death. They may forget all that is noble and forget

God Himself. In their senility they may even curse God and die. What hope is there for them? The oneliness of an old man is pathetic and difficult to endure. It would seem to be an act of wisdom to get rid of the life of one's self and of those one loves.* Something in our existence prevents us from that course. That something is natural. Is it untrue, evil and unreasonable? If life is not eternal, it is so. If life is not progressing towards goodness and the spirit, it is certainly so. Is there a sub-conscious instinct in man that he is not alone, unfriended, unloved and helpless and ephemeral, which makes him love life, when all men, all his dear ones, are dead or have deserted him and he is hopeless and helpless?

Every man must go through the tragedy and darkness and doubts of decay and senility. But when old, people have one great advantage. They can have no illusions. They have tried all the springs of life and can know what is true. The experiences of life may make them try to stand steadfast. The merciful Father is not unmindful of them, let them be sure. Decay and death are necessary for higher life and greater love of God. Let them trust Him, if they can. Let them not forget that God is with them. Let them, like the unfortunate devotee, Raja Ram Krishna, be anxious that they may not so forget, and let them like him ask their friends and servants to remind them of the fact when they forget. We are weak and helpless. If the great and merciful God exist and be with us, it means that He will be with us till eternity.

*We have seen before how poor saintly Bunyan and Tolstoy felt.

Let us be steadfast in that belief, if we can, and do our duty, so far as our powers allow us.

We have found that the very essence of life is effort and individuality and freedom and the capacity for progress to more and higher wisdom, goodness and spirituality. We have further found that the efforts of the living being are not by themselves sufficient to bring about the glorious result. Over and above all the labours of living beings, the help of another person outside nature is indispensable and apparent. The rationalist tells us that we fondly believe in God and immortality because out of our weakness we desire to do so. Buddha says, we are in the net of God which is mischievous and only leads to bondage and inevitable ultimate pain and makes us forget that life is an evil which should be got rid of. Individual life is a temporary illusion and is distinctness from God or the universe is only formal and not essential, says the philosopher. All this would be true with the idea of God and life and life's desires, as understood in Buddha's and Sankara's time, and as understood even now by many religious men and philosophers. But if individual life is ephemeral, whether the net of God exists or not, whether individual life is an illusion or not, all end in pain and soon enough do our all end, and we need not cast a thought on the matter. The true idea of God and self certainly leads to higher and nobler individual life and not to abjectly dependent, selfish, impure, ignoble life, and not to Nirvana, nor to the merciless and loveless inactive All, indistinguishable from nothingness.

Eternal life would be a horrible chimera, if the individual had all in his own way, or if he were wholly dependent on another, if he shot across the infinite heavens as a brilliant comet for all time, free from all restraint, or if he burnt in hell for offending the man-imagined "jealous" God or for not believing in the divinity of the Bible and Christ or of the Koran and Mahomet or of the Veda and Krishna, or if he revelled in hymn-singing or in carnal pleasures eternally in heaven, or coalesced with the One, the Brahman, the Absolute, the disinterested Seer. The true idea of life is that of a free individual, restrained to the path of progress by, and working in co-operation with, the loving Father of all. From dead matter, or all-but dead matter, we have been evolved. We hold this life for the purposes of that high Power, which has brought it into existence. If that power is evil and unmerciful, we are lost for ever. But we find that with the growth of life, evil is giving place to good. That Power therefore is certainly good. The struggle, which is evolving the good, is not for a day. It is a struggle for all time; all interest in life would cease, if it ceased. If all who took part in the fight were ephemeral, the struggle also would be ephemeral. Life is an eternal battle for the good. Let us stand firm and undergo pains and sorrows, and labour for the high purpose of bringing out the highest good. Our frail material body and mind often find the strain unbearable and we desire to be at rest. We desire

more for death than for life, just as we desire more for the material pleasures than for the good. We have a natural inclination to seek the rest of matter, which is still the predominant constituent of life. We find no sufficient interest in life, in the good and in the spirit. It cannot be helped. We must go through this darkness of matter, doubt and death. All of us have the experience of David of feeling that "the sorrows of death have compassed us and the pains of hell have got hold of us ; we have found trouble and sorrow," and we are in despair, unless when we "call upon the name of the Lord" in our extremity, "He inclineth His ear unto us."* However that may be, the noble man who believes in One, Who causes the flower of goodness to spring forth and expand to perfect beauty and out of His great mercy requires for the accomplishment of the result the strenuous free-will endeavour and sacrifice of the individual living being, would surely stand firm and work with Him till eternity. Life is eternal. But its eternal character can be good and desirable only if the good and merciful loving Father be with us, whom He made free. He is with us. He is among His children, though they know Him not. If they knew that fact to a certainty, all effort and progress would cease, and it would be no better than if there were no God. We do not know God's high purpose. We serve that purpose to the end. Our weakness and meanness and poverty of spirit are all known to the Father, Who has brought us into existence from dead matter and dirt.

* Psalms CXVI.

He has fashioned us with His hands. Let us love that hand, even if it strikes us dead.

We know little now and are in the darkness of matter. The light is slowly emerging into view. Living beings shall certainly know better in future. They shall probably know better the character of life and the purpose of the Lord of life. Let us be strong and fear not in the meantime. Let us believe that in this impenetrable darkness, in which the bark of our little individual life is tossing in the shoreless tempestuous sea of existence, we see the shining palm of a hand uplifted above the awful, infinite, surrounding gloom, which we recognize as the symbol of certain delivery from all terrors and of ineffable blessings, and that we can hear "a small still voice", which makes the inmost heart of all life vibrate with inexpressible joy, saying, "I am with you; be of good cheer." We poor, suffering, dying individuals, though we know little now, have every reason to believe that we are not friendless and uncared for and that our life is not evanescent and that the weakest and the humblest of the sons and daughters of men have their part in the evolution of the Good and have their places appointed for them, with infinite love and care, in the Kingdom of Heaven.

THE END.

INDEX.

	PAGE.		PAGE.
ANTHROPOMORPHISM	... 160	Diderot	... 157
AGNOSTICISM	... 4 17	Dodwell	... 626
ASCETICISM :—		Driesch	... 266
Origin and Growth of	... 384	Dodwell	... 629
Austerity leading to power	415	Einstein	115, 754
AUTHORS (CITED).		Erdmann	153, 659.
Agassiz	... 283	Feuerbach	... 414
Aristotle	... 349	Fichte	... 163
Augustine	... 455	Francis St.	... 415
Austin	... 350		Page.
Baader	84, 398	Geddes	... 174
Bain	223, 233, 235	Gibboni	... 60
Bana	... 41	Gooch	... 29
Barker	... 657	Gregson	173, 178
Baumgarten	... 153	Goethe	479, 648
Bayle	... 118	Gorham	... 352
Bentham	... 355	Haeckel	109, 123, 185, 191, 198, 199, 212, 283, 291
Bergson	97, 202, 235, 251, 257, 258, 261, 284, 414, 641	Head	... 641
Berkeley	45, 131, 153	Hegel	84, 97, 260, 642
Blavatasky	... 530	Helmholz	... 648
Bosanquet	101, 642	Heraclitus	... 257
Bradley	... 90	Hilty	... 662
Buddha	41, 42 289, 300, 414, 468	Hobbes	... 350
Buddha Ghosha	567, 643	Hook	174, 226, 362, 445, 451
Burgess	— 536	Hume	131, 163, 231
Burns	... 409	Huxley	145, 205, 301, 481
Bury	... 147	Jacobi	... 162
Bloomfield	... 86	James William	145, 148, 149, 415, 455 458, 462, 525, 539, 612, 625, 662.
Beecher	73	Johannes	... 205
Butler	... 350	Kant	97, 109, 123, 145, 283, 349, 408, 656
Bunyan—		Kidd	4, 656
Clifford	... 186	Krause	... 162
Confucious	— 348	Kelvin	... 284
Condillac	350, 646	Lange	96, 129
Chrysostom st.	... 35	Lankester	99, 219
Carlyle	... 35	Leibnitz	84, 153, 292
Comte	34, 35	Locke	94, 165
Cope	... 256	Lombroso	... 377
Darwin	... 297	Lotze	98, 138, 182, 471
Descartes	165, 466		
De Sitter	... 117		

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Loyla	... 528	Stevenson	... 625
Luther	... 480	Stirling	... 471
Macdonald	... 379	Sutherland	32, 352
Macaulay	... 427	Spinoza	162, 641
Mcdougall	262, 267	Strato	... 186
Macchiaville	147, 395	Swedenborg	... 281
Mahomet	52, 57	Sisirkumar Ghose	... 285
Maine	... 348	Theresa St.	... 529
Manu	... 348	Thomson	174, 180, 188, 249
Mill	39, 233, 330		272
Moore	152, 175, 181, 191, 150, 416	Tolstoy	... 480, 617
Molinos	... 539	Tyler	429, 443, 451
Morell	... 115	Udayana	... 414
Mozley	... 619	Vacherot	145, 416
Muirhead	... 559	Vyasa	... 103
Muller	... 205	Wallace	... 399
Marcus Aurelius	... 578	Waller	... 297
Max Muller	... 423	Ward	... 192
Myer	... 544	Wilson	... 230
Nagasena	232, 639	Wolff	... 150
Newton	... 85	Wundt	... 204
Ostwald	... 205	Zeno	... 654
Nietzsche	153, 390, 397	Zoroaster	326, 319
Palgrave	... 53	BIOLOGY AND RELIGION : ...	127
Paley	... 291	Immortality and biology.	242
Patanjali	... 529	BLOODY SACRIFICES	... 7-9
Pattison	92, 101, 138, 153, 180, 640, 642.		
Pierce	... 193	BUDDHISM	... 49
Plato	294, 334, 348	Its philosophy	... 220
Rayce	... 640	CHARITY :—	
Read	392, 448	Origin and growth of	... 385
Reinke	... 201	CHASTITY	375, 596
Ribot	145, 416	CHRISTIANITY :—	
Ritschl	... 138	Affirmance of Mosaic	
Rousseau	... 163	law	23, 60
Russell	... 122	Dogmas of	... 65
Sale	... 52	Sin	... 65
Saltar	... 10	Atonement	... 66
Sankara	... 384	Mediator	... 69
Schelling	... 102	Natural immortality de-	
Schopenhauer	... 291	nied	72, 629
Scott	... 74	COMMON LIFE :—	
Schiermacher	... 413	Religion and	... 606
Seeley	... 415	Morality intended for	
Spencer Herbert	4, 234, 303, 349, 375, 417, 414, 450	the poor	... 607
		Struggle of the poor and	
		noble life	... 609

	PAGE.		PAGE.
How the weak prevail over strong	... 617	ETHICS—(<i>Contd</i>)	
Common life and spirituality	... 622	Love	... 274
Common life and belief in God	... 626	Mercy	... 276
CONSCIENCE—See morality.		EVIL :—	
Mill on	... 350	Mystery of	... 321
CONSCIOUSNESS	... 226	Lodge on	... 321
Change of impressions	233, 264	History of ideas of evil	... 325
Essence of	... 234	Zoroaster on	... 326
Continuity of self	... 239	Hindu idea	... 327
Growth of	266, 641, 638	Jewish idea	... 327
Transcends time	... 644	Christian idea	... 327
Transcends ideas of the finite	... 644	Desire whether evil	... 332
Is progressive	... 260	Sin	333, 340
Death and	... 264	Plato's idea	... 334
CREATION :—		Philosophic idea, evil is ignorance	... 335
By life	... 284	Modern idea	... 335
Power of thought	... 284	True character of	341, 345
By God	... 285	Pain and evil	... 343
Limitation in	... 285	Idea of good and evil progressive	... 343
Of newer and better	... 142	FREE WILL	... 585
DARSANAS	... 91	FRENCH REVOLUTION	... 73
DEATH, see immortality—		FUNCTIONAL MEMORY	299, 226
Lodge on	... 240	GOD :—	
Biology and	... 243	Definition of	... 148
Necessitated by greater individuality	... 637	Philosophic ideas of	145, 149, 151
DESIRE :—		Creation of newer and better	... 142
Desireless action impossible	... 132	Co-operation with living being	... 143
Effects of	... 133	Separate existence of self and	... 153
Connection between desire and sense-organs	... 134	Anthropomorphism	160, 481
Desire for higher life	... 136	Whether unknowable	... 161
Free strenuous effort and	137	Idea of God grows	... 168
Not evil 332	His influence indispensable for progress and life	... 251
DETERMINISM	... 585	Relation between God and self	... 289
DUALISM	... 198	Dependence on God	... 579
ETERNITY :—		God and pleasure	... 309
Three meanings of	... 630	God and morality	354, 452
ETHICAL RELIGION	... 39	Idea of spirit	... 443
ETHICS—See morality.		History of the evolution of the idea of God	... 451
Functional memory and	269		
Biology and	270, 274		

	PAGE.		PAGE.
GOD—(Contd.)		IMMORTALITY:—	
Goodness and God	452, 354	Pain and	310
Iranian idea	452	Biology and	243
Augustine's idea	455	Hæckel on	247
Idea of universal God	456	Idea grows with life	618
God and philosophy	145	No idea in ancient times	628
Instinct to make gods	484	God and immortality es-	
Consciousness of God	500	sential for higher life	
Ignorance of God's help			630, 634
necessary for progress	493	Life and time	630
Help from outside power		Consciousness transcends	614
manifest	494	time	655
Led life	616	Future interests and	637
GOODNESS—See morality.		Consciousness and	938, 655
Morality of revealed re-		Group life and	655
ligions	387	Distinctness of selves	
Morality of ancient times	347	and	644
Speculations about	344	Direct proof	661
Socrates and Plato on	384	INDIVIDUALITY—See conscious-	
Spencer on	349	ness, self.	
Kant on	349	Is progressive	260
Nietzsche on	390	Absolute individuality	263, 68
Mill on	350	INFINITE	163
Austin and Maine on	351	Idea growing	164
Laws and moral ideas		Consciousness transcends	164
change	352	Ideas of finite	165
Rationalists on	352, 355	INSTINCT (see life)	114
Impossible without God		INTELLIGENCE—See life.	
	354, 452	Thought whether wholly im-	
Idea of the absolute		material	253
good	404	JAVA Hinduism	50
Better accompanies more		KARMA	585
lasting	407	KINGDOM OF HEAVEN	658
HINDUISM	46	LIFE:—	
Java form	47	Origin of	184
HYPNOTISM	650	Characteristics of	173
IDEA—See philosophy.		Volition and powers of	
Two great divisions	111	determination	223, 226, 233
Ideas connected with		Purposiveness	226
life	112	Desire	136
Ideas connected with		Memory and conscious-	
matter	112	ness	226
Ideas and matter	222, 92, 108	Structure and function	
Apriori ideas	109	and higher life	180
Materialization	285	Decay and death	240-250
IMMORTALITY—See morality.		Continuity of self	239
Lombroso on	376	Creative power of	127, 284
			142

	PAGE.		PAGE.
LIFE—(Contd.)		MATERIALISM—(Contd.)	
Power over matter ...	178	MERCY EVOLUTION OF ...	276
Relatedness of matter, life and spirit ...	126	MONISM AND DUALISM ...	198
A mediating process be- tween matter and spirit	248	MORALITY :—	
How spiritual is evolved from material ...	250	See goodness, ethics.	
Spiritual dominates in life	276	Evolution from unethical nature	98
Ethics and ...	270	History of	364-370
Feeling value of things	138	Self love and social laws	386
Power to transcend itself	130	Survival of fittest and	392
Interest is in progressive life ...	140	Society and reason as sources of	388, 393
Beig'on's theory ...	258	Religious dogmas as sour- ces of	396
Udayana's theory ...	258	Practical morality ...	575
Buddha's chain of causa- tion of life ...	229	Philosophers on	348, 352
Freedom indispensable to progress ...	129	History of moral rules	364 370
Mechanism and finalism both untenable ...	256	Different for different classes ...	362
Higher life depends on lower life ...	268	Self-sacrifice ...	368
Influence of God indis- pensable ...	259	Murder ...	371
Thought centres ...	196	Asceticism	584
Attention and idea ne- cessary for the exercise of the sense-organs ...	184	Truth ...	372
Johannes' theory of energy of sensory nerves ...	205	Honesty ...	374
A priori ideas and phre- noma ...	209	Chastity ...	375
LOVE :—		Honor ...	386
Evolution of ...	274	Justice ...	375
Of God ...	278	Mercy ...	380
MAHOMEDANISM ...	51	Charity ...	385
MATERIALISM :—		Love ...	377
Ideas about orderliness	192	Physical organs and	376
Machine theory	195, 256	Influx from out side	399
Its conception of two kinds ...	206	Wallace on	399
Materialization of thought and ideas ...	282	Natural causes of	400
Memory ...	226	What is	402
Mill's idea ...	226	Absolute good	404
		MYSTICISM ...	519
		Subliminal consciousness	
		of two kinds	520
		Higher consciousness	521
		Effects of quiescent mind	524
		Mysticism of two kinds...	525
		Illusions and illumination	528
		Tantrika practices	529
		Remarkable phenomena	531
		Abnormal conditions	532

	PAGE.		PAGE.
MYSTICISM—(Contd.)		PHILOSOPHY—(Contd.)	
Suggestions and sense of		Reality ...	87
unity with God ...	534	Three classes of Philosophers ...	95
Latent will power ...	541	Reality dependent on progressive life and God ...	89
Four conditions in mysticism ...	542	Words, ideas and reality ...	92
Healthy-mindedness ...	543	Glorification of ideas ...	92
Where the better is evolved ...	544	Analysis of sense—perceptions ...	107
Religion and mysticism ...	544	Constituents of emotions ...	108
Processes of Yoga ...	326	A priori ideas, Kant and Haeckel on them ...	109
NATIONALISM ...	30	Two great divisions of ideas ...	111
PAIN :—		Freedom ...	129
Mystery of ...	291	Power of transcending in life ...	130
Has grades ...	305	Doctrine of values ...	131, 138, 139
Philosophy and science on ...	291	Passive perception impossible ...	131
God and pain ...	293	Attention ...	132
Plato's position ...	294	Desire ...	137
Yoga and abolition of pain ...	295	Interest in life is in progressive life ...	140
Vedantic principles ...	296	Progressive good and absolute good ...	141
Materialistic idea ...	296	Philosophic ideas of God and religion ...	145
Pain greater than pleasure ...	297	Finite and infinite ...	163
Darwin and William James on ...	297	Philosophic speculations and popular religions ...	157
Origin and true nature of ...	301	PLEASURE :—	
Huxley's definition ...	301	See pain.	
Spiritual element of pain ...	299	Has grades ...	306
Pain and life inseparable ...	299	Nature of ...	307
Morality and mercy result from pain ...	304	Eternal heaven of absolute pleasure and eternal hell myths ...	30
Pain is austerly ...	576	Pleasure is at root of life ...	301
Cry of pain how answered ...	305	God's influence and ...	308
Pain and immortality ...	310	POSITIVE RELIGION ...	416
PANTHEISM :—		Definition of ...	429
See philosophy.		Is personal relationship with God ...	438
Denies void space ...	121	POSITIVISM ...	34
PHILOSOPHY :—			
Philosophy and religion ...	83		
Philosophers and scientists apologists for existing religions ...	84		
Philosophers generally pantheistic ...	86		

	PAGE.		PAGE.
PRIESTS, NECESSITY OF	579	RIGHT CONDUCT :—	
PRAYER :—		See morality.	
Contemned by philoso-		Rule of	550, 565
pheis	502	Practical morality	575
Generally for gross		Personal interest and	572
things	502	Evolution of the spiritual	571
Fulfilment of	503, 504, 511	Pain as austerity	576
Myer's idea	504	Happiness of the many	579
Natural instinct	560	Dependence on God	579
Desire to help accom-		Ideal of growth	591
panies distress	508	Goodness and prudence	553
Led life	661	Happiness and	555
PURANAS	120	Effort indispensable	563
QUIETISM	64, 539	Culture	563
RATIONALISTS	10	SIN :—	
Evil and	329	Spinoza's opinion	64
Morality and	352	Molinos on	64
RELATIVITY	115	Christian idea	65
Puranic idea	120	History of ideas of	357
RELIGION :—		Sin and evil	533, 340
Three divisions, personal,		Sin and duty	338
state, philosophic	18	Sin and remorse	339
Its public character	19	SELF :—	
How separated from the		See Individuality, Life, Philo-	
state	25	sophy.	
Freedom of conscience	27	Idea of	464
Consequences of insist-		Self and universe	469
ing on false doctrines	74	Distinctions between sel-	
Philosophic ideas of	145	ves	642, 644
Images, forms, rituals how		Progress is of the indivi-	
created	146	dual	642
Worship of nothingness	148	Consciousness of self	
Little affected by philo-		grows	641
sophy	158	SOCIALISM	37
Use of philosophic spe-		SOCIETY :—	
culations	157	See Morality.	
Definitions of philoso-		Higher reason of	388
phers	410	Morality and	393
Eclecticism	422	SOUL :—	
Originally not pure	423	Ideas of	194
Primitive	426	Haeckel's conclusion	197
Growth and develop-		Whether lower animals	
ment of	424	have	201
Positive religion	429	Wundt's dualism	204
Common life and	606	Republic of cells	266
		Entelechy	266

INDEX

676

	PAGE.		PAGE.
SPACE :—		UNITY WITH GOD	87, 534
A priori idea of	... 209	UTILITARIANISM	... 37
Kant and Haeckel on	... 109	VARUNA	... 153
Void space incompatible		VEDANTA	... 193
with pantheism	... 121	VOLITION	... 238
SPIRIT :—		WOMAN :—	
History of the idea of	... 143	Position of	... 594
Dominates power, reason		True chastity	... 596
and matter	... 487	Woman and religious	
Spiritual law governing		men	... 597
life	... 497	Society and ethics de-	
Evolution of the spiritual	571	pend on sexual rela-	
Material ideas of the		tion	... 599
spirit of the philoso-		Love first felt by mother	600
phers and writers	... 621	Woman receptacle of de-	
Spiritual, the foundation		vine love	... 601
of the material	... 621	Mission of sacrifice	... 602
Alternative to the spiri-		Woman's advantage in	
tual is the miraculous	203	religion	... 603
SPIRITUALISM	... 535	WORSHIP :—	
THEOSOPHY	... 50	Worship and prayer	... 02
TANTRIKISM	525-529	What it is	... 515
TRANSCENDENCE	... 151	Of words	147
TIME	... 115	Of nothingness	145
Life and time	... 630	YOGA :—	
Memory and time	... 641	Processes of	... 526
Kant and Haeckel on	... 109	YOGINEES	... 525
Einstein on	... 115	ZENDAVESTA	... 151
Puranic idea	... 120		
Idea of	... 125		

201/GHO



2896

